

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management :

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.
(*Hon. Treasurer.*)

With the Chairman,
representing the Council
of the Classical
Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*), representing
the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the
Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University.

Vol. XLVI

DECEMBER, 1932

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	241	REVIEWS (continued) :	
PROGRESSVS VTERQUE. F. A. TODD ..	243	<i>Per la storia della satira</i> (Terzaghi). J.	
HORACE, <i>Odes</i> , III. 4 : DATE AND INTERPRE-		WIGHT DUFF	263
TATION. L. A. MACKAY	243	<i>The Reign of Tiberius</i> (Marsh). M. P.	
HORACE, <i>Epistles</i> , I. 2. 30-31. L. A. MACKAY	245	CHARLESWORTH	264
'BYZANTIOS OLENT LACERTOS' (STAT. S. 4, 9,		<i>L'Opera dell'Imperatore Claudio</i> (Momi-	
13). D'A. W. THOMPSON	246	gliano). J. P. V. D. BALSDON	266
BEDE AND VEGETIUS. C. W. JONES ..	248	<i>La Poesia di Calpurnio Siculo</i> (Cesareo).	
THE COST OF THE PROPYLAEA. J. E. POWELL	250	W. F. J. KNIGHT	267
EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES. A. CAMERON ..	250	<i>Le Tragedie di Seneca</i> (Cesareo). W. F. J.	
A LINE OF THE <i>Iambi</i> OF CALLIMACHUS. H.		KNIGHT	269
J. M. MILNE	250	<i>Lucan-interpretationen</i> (Wuensch). W. B.	
REVIEWS :		ANDERSON	270
<i>A Study in Creative History</i> (Burton). J. L.		<i>The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Sub-</i>	
MYRES	250	<i>jects</i> , II (Bailey). R. O. MOON	271
<i>Relative Ortsbezeichnung</i> (Stürenburg). W.		<i>Die römische Taktik zu Beginn der Kaiserzeit</i>	
M. CALDER	251	<i>und die Geschichtschreibung</i> (Lammert).	
<i>Theognis</i> (Jacoby). E. HARRISON	252	H. M. D. PARKER	271
<i>Beiträge zur Lex Porsoniana</i> (Bill). E.		<i>The Script of Cologne from Hildebald to Her-</i>	
HARRISON	256	<i>mann</i> (Jones). A. SOUTER	272
<i>Platon : La République</i> , I-III (Chambray).		SHORT REVIEWS	273
A. L. PECK	258	CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY	276
<i>The Treasurers of Athena</i> (Ferguson). R.		SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	277
MEIGGS	259	BOOKS RECEIVED	277
<i>La catoptronomie grecque et ses dérivés</i>		INDEX	279
(Delatte). W. R. HALLIDAY	260		
<i>Epirus</i> (Cross). W. W. TARN	261		
<i>Griechische literarische Papyri</i> , I (Gerstinger).			
J. U. POWELL	262		

LONDON : JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK : G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

A NEW VOLUME OF THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY

VOLUME IX. The Roman Republic, 133-44 B.C.

Edited by S. A. COOK, F. E. ADCOCK, and
M. P. CHARLESWORTH

Royal 8vo. With 25 maps, tables, and plans. 37s. 6d. net

This volume covers the period from the Gracchi to the death of Caesar and describes the gradual breakdown of the Senatorial Republic. In addition to the story of that sequence of political crises induced by a succession of great men, it contains chapters on Pontus and its neighbours, the Jews, Parthia, the government of the Princes, Roman Literature, Ciceronian society, Roman Republican art, and the development of Roman law.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

annual
of 5s.
edings
ssical
ssical
s the
y be

, Mr.
ent to
Hon.
or to
wyth,
eeds,
orth
tern,

THE
Rom
Geo
serv
arily
jour
men
to b
nun
from
pick
ess
jud
of
cla
hav
led
tim
diff
the
wis
like
den
tha
the
in
the
im
sup
gra
pe
nic
ce
an
pe

W
ic
sh
hi
th
't
pr
A
ch
ha

The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1932

NOTES AND NEWS

THE second volume of *Greece and Rome* opens with a Foreword by Sir George Macdonald, who pays a deserved compliment to the extraordinarily high standard which the new journal has maintained, and appeals to members of the Classical Association to become subscribers to it. The first number contains many good things, from which, *honoris causa*, we would pick out three. One of these is an essay by Mr. Stanley Casson, with judicious illustrations, on the history of the standards of taste applied to classical art. He shows how fortuitous have been the circumstances which have led to the veering of taste from time to time, and pleads that the work of different periods should be judged by the standard of what individual artists wished to achieve. 'Because we may like the Archaic we must avoid condemning the Classical. Admit rather that in the Primitive period lies interest, the interest of unsuccessful ambition; in the Archaic period lies the charm of the exquisite, of the formal and of the imaginative; in the Olympian period superb mastery of material and the grandeur of conception; in the Pheidian period the absolute perfection of technique and the achievement of magnificent idealism in stone.' Admit all these, and you may still have full liberty of personal preference.

In 'Tacitus Reconsidered' Mr. H. W. White appears as a nimble and witty iconoclast. He has little difficulty in showing that on the formal side of historiography Tacitus was weak; that the historian in him was too partial to 'the headlined matter of the sensational press,' and that the make-up of his *Annals* was distorted by a craving for cheap effect. A more unconventional hammer-blow at this 'ancient dyspep-

tic, out of humour with himself, his circumstances and the world,' is Mr. White's documented assertion that Tacitus could not bring himself to write Latin. The plain Ciceronian or Caesarian '*cum aequo periculosum esset seu falsa seu vera diceret*' must be painted red to match a lurid tale, and emerges as '*iuxta periculoso ficta seu vera promeret*.' And what would be done to a fourth-form boy who translated 'graciously' by '*comi via*'? Is *this* what Tacitus found in '*Horatii et Vergilii et Lucani sacrario*'? 'The sleepy family habits of the words are broken up, they group themselves in a tantalising phrase; it is certainly unusual; but is the unusual always to be regarded as fresh, as original, as good?'

If we answer that success is the measure of the successful, Mr. White is again ready for us. Success with whom? Had not the Emperor Tacitus, towards A.D. 300, to see to it that his namesake's work should not perish *lectorum incuria*? And we are set wondering whether anybody reads Carlyle or Meredith nowadays, and if not why not? Or again, ought words to be encouraged to retain their sleepy family habits? Mr. White's very shrewd criticism deserves the attention of Professor Wight Duff and of the Archbishop of York.

In 'The Pronunciation of Latin' Dr. Alington has been persuaded by the Editors to trail his coat once more before the world of learning and teaching, and remind us that there are still Schools in England which refuse to bow the knee to the Baal of the Classical Association. His statement of a familiar case is temperate and courteous, and he finds it easy to dispose of some of the very bad arguments which were urged in favour of a reform

which seemed almost too sensible to be practicable. The responsibility for the chaos, practical and emotional, which always exists when stage-coaches are being replaced by trains must, we suppose, be borne by the parties in equal shares. But when Dr. Alington asks us to put back the clock 'in the name of those who are trying, under great difficulties, to maintain the classical tradition in England' we are tempted to ask for a list of their names and addresses. Meantime we rejoice with many of them in the thought that their grandsons, while they will no longer have any excuse for inditing *omnia mōventur*, will still be permitted to say *flōreat Etona*, or something very like it.

W. M. C.

The *Oresteia* was performed at Cambridge in 1921 by members of the University, in an abbreviated version prepared by Mr. J. T. Sheppard and with music composed for the occasion by Dr. C. Armstrong Gibbs. This production will be repeated at the New Theatre, Cambridge, on 14-18 February, 1933, with matinées on the 16th and 18th. Dr. Armstrong Gibbs's music will again be used, and scenery and costumes are being designed by Mrs. G. Raverat. The University Press will shortly issue a revised acting edition with a verse translation by Mr. Sheppard, who will as usual produce the play with the assistance of Mr. J. Burnaby. Details of the performances and information about special arrangements for parties from schools, etc., can be obtained from Mr. G. H. W. Rylands of King's College.

L'Union Académique Internationale has published a pamphlet, *Emploi des signes critiques* (see *C.R.*, p. 240), which should be heeded by every editor of a critical text. It is a great thing to have a code of rules for symbols in the body of the text, for the arrangement of the *apparatus criticus*, and for compendia to be used therein. The code

of the U.A.I. is chiefly the work of Bidez, Drachmann, and Hude, but their draft had passed muster with American scholars and others before ratification. Now we have something to which editors in general will do well to conform; and if anyone for special reasons departs from it he had better say why.

Neophilologus, the Dutch but polyglot quarterly devoted to modern languages, and to the classical tongues in their bearings on those of today, fortunately takes a broad view of its scope. In the issue for 1932 the student of English will find on adjoining pages discussions of 'belong' and 'hike.' Through three numbers of that year runs a long German essay on rhythm, important for Greek and Latin as well as for other languages, from the well-known authority A. W. de Groot. XVII, 2 has a careful study of 'De Verfoiede (*Μισοῦμενος*) van Menander' by W. E. J. Kuiper. In XVIII, 1, the latest instalment, Sister Agnes Dicker gives a list of Latin words of colour, with references to the ancient authors, concerning herself for the present with their morphological aspects, and adding nothing but their nearest equivalents in Dutch; but a semantic sequel is in store. Three of the four numbers for the year include an 'aankondiging van eigen werk,' in which an author tells us about his new book; a godsend to the author-editor who cannot in his own journal let his work receive praise or even blame.

The issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1932, will contain summaries and appreciations of the work recently done in the following subjects: Greek Language and Literature, Latin Language and Literature, Greek History, Roman History, Greek and Roman Religion, Ancient Philosophy, Papyri, Greek Archaeology and Excavation, Italian Archaeology and Excavation.

PROGRESSVS VTERQVE.

Iamque intra iactum teli progressus uterque
substitit. Verg. *Aen.* XI 608-9.

THIS simple statement has been misunderstood by editors and translators and lexicographers almost universally, unless charity require that the many editors who pass it without comment receive the benefit of the doubt. Of the editors who are accessible to me, Ruæus and Forbiger and Benoist and Ladewig and Page are definitely wrong; so are the translators Mackail, Lonsdale and Lee, Jackson, and Fairclough; so also are the lexicographers Merguet and Wetmore. The error of all these has consisted in taking *progressus* as the perfect participle of *progredior*, thereby forcing upon *uterque* the sense of *uterque exercitus*. But even if such a use of *uterque*, analogous to the collective use of *Romanus*, *Poenus*, etc., were in itself possible, it would be excluded here by the fact that the reference is not to two homogeneous armies, each under a single leader, but to two groups of contingents the units of which are specified—namely to the *manus Troiana* and the *Etrusci duces* and the *equitum exercitus*

on the one side, and to *Messapus* and the *Latini* and *cum fratre Coras* and the *ala Camillae* on the other.

I find, with mixed feelings, that I have been anticipated by Heyne, though apparently by no one else, in pointing out that *progressus* is not the participle but the noun; but after a decent interval of a century and a half one may venture, in the interest of accurate scholarship and for the honour of a great scholar, to draw attention to his note. In rejecting the variant *substitit*, Heyne writes: '*Non agmina, sed agminum progressus substitisse dicitur.*' The sentence means: 'And now each advance had stopped within javelin-throw.' There is no need to labour the argument, but one may usefully observe that in the two verses 607 and 608 Virgil has used four such verbal nouns, namely *aduentus*, *fremitus*, *iactus* and *progressus*. One hopes to see the noun *progressus* added to the Virgilian vocabulary in the next edition of Wetmore's invaluable *Index Verborum Vergilianus*.

FREDK. A. TODD.

University of Sydney.

HORACE, ODES, III. 4: DATE AND INTERPRETATION.

IT is almost incredible that the longest Ode in the four books, placed in the centre of the Roman Odes, should be merely a piece of decoration without any special content, and when the second, third, fifth and sixth all deal with definite aspects of Augustus' policy, it seems unlikely that eighty lines should be given up to a general eulogy comparing the victorious Augustus to the victorious Jupiter.

Nowhere else does Horace compare Augustus to Jupiter. Castor, Pollux, Hercules, Quirinus, Bacchus, Mercury are his parallels, not the god who

urbes regnaque tristia
divosque mortalesque turbas
imperio regit unus aequo.

Where Augustus and Jupiter are mentioned together, it is always made clear that Augustus is *minor*; they are no more on a level than Augustus and one of his legates would be. Augustus for

Horace is not *deus Caesar*; even in the fourth book he is addressed merely as *dux bone*. The fact that he is spoken of as *divus*, not *deus*, indeed proves nothing, for Apollo is also called *divus* (*Od.* IV. 6). But Horace's whole attitude shows that he gave Augustus his loyal support because he considered him to be, as Augustus himself claimed, in a sense the restorer of the republic. He saw Augustus not as the Vergilian monarch, but as a Ciceronian *princeps*. However little credit it does to his political insight, Horace retained his republican sympathies as he retained his republican friends. The speech that Dio puts in the mouth of Agrippa may at least be taken to show the existence of such a sentiment among even Augustus' friends; and whether or no there be any accuracy in the ascription of the opposite view to Maecenas, Horace has given so clear

proofs of his independence that we need not think him bound to follow the monarchic idea blindly.

If one tries to approach the fourth Ode without preconceptions, one must be struck by the amazing length of the introduction—forty lines, half the Ode. The first thirty-six lines are devoted to a lengthy development of the idea that the poet is and always has been under the direct protection of the Muses, that they will preserve him inviolate from the fiercest animals and the wildest barbarians. The next four lines mention Augustus' devotion to the Muses.

What is the point of this lengthy proemium? 'I am a privileged character,' he says, 'on account of my poetic gift. Even beasts and barbarians recognise this. Augustus is a cultured man.' Surely the inference is, 'I can trust him to take in good part what I am going to say.' And what does he say? That Augustus is a Jupiter on earth, who has destroyed his opponents as ruthlessly as Jupiter did the Titans, and it served them right. Was that such a dangerous thing to say in Rome after Actium, that Horace had to beg Augustus' pardon in forty lines for his temerity? Surely lines 41-80 must imply a much more serious criticism of Augustus' policy, or what Horace feared might be Augustus' policy. Orelli's note on the passage shows that he regarded it as containing quite as much warning as praise.

It is pretty clear that the preceding Ode is a protest put into the mouth of Juno, either against a possible resumption of the proposal ascribed to Julius Caesar, of transferring the capital to the East, or more probably against the imitation of the Eastern monarchic ideal. (See De Witt, C.R. XXXIV. 35 f.) In similar fashion, he is very careful to ascribe this Ode to Calliope, and to depreciate his own importance, in the playful account of his early inspiration.

In lines 41 ff. he says,

Vos lene consilium et datis et dato
gaudetis, almae. scimus, ut impios, etc.

Can Jupiter's treatment of the Titans reasonably be described as *lene consilium* and so offered as an example of the

advice the Muses give Augustus when he has disbanded his army (ll. 37-38)? Are we to think of him as *finire quaerentem labores* in this Sullan fashion? What then is the *lene consilium* that the Muses, in this case through Horace, give Augustus? Surely that such crushing revenge against rebels is a prerogative of omnipotence; let Augustus rather show mercy. This does not, of course, imply that Horace himself necessarily believed in the gods, only that Augustus is not to think himself one.

If the accident of the falling tree is correctly dated March 1st, 30 B.C., it is probable that this Ode occurs within one or two years of that date; it would hardly be like Horace to keep harping on it years afterward. There is then reason to believe that the Ode dates from 30-28 B.C., probably from 29, about the time of Augustus' return, when men were still wondering what treatment the opponents of Augustus might expect. They could hardly have forgotten the Octavius of the proscriptions, the '*morendum est*' and '*descende carnifex*' stories.

There is no reason to stress the Britons and Spaniards of lines 33-36 at the expense of the Scythians in an attempt to find a reference to the proposed expedition of 28 B.C. They are merely examples of remote and savage barbarians at the two ends of the earth.

But the fate of rebels was not the only thing occupying men's mind at that time. Even more important were the relations of Augustus and the State. *Consilium* recurs in line 65, *Vis consili expers mole ruit sua*. It is probable that Horace had Antony in mind, but also Antony's master and model, Julius Caesar. 'That tragedy (the murder of Caesar) showed clearly that the Roman world would not consent to be long governed by the sword alone' (Marsh, *The Founding of the Roman Empire*). It has been noted before that the crime of Orion, Tityus, and Pirithous (ll. 70-80) lay in their presumption, their attempt to assume the privilege of gods. The moral is that Augustus must not attempt to follow the example of Caesar and Antony, and institute a monarchy by divine right, after the Oriental pat-

tern. Julius Caesar had stressed his divinity too much, Antony had played the god too much in the East. There must be none of that in Italy. In the light of the extravagant honours paid to Augustus after the capture of Alexandria, and after the Parthian succession was referred to his arbitration, when his name was to be coupled with the names of the gods in hymns, there was room for uneasiness. Perhaps this is why we have *credidimus*, and the emphasis on *caelo*, in III. 5. 1. Augustus has fulfilled Horace's hopes by refusing to model his rule on the absolute and ruthless sovereignty of Jupiter. Like Hercules and Bacchus, he will show himself *divus* rather by subduing foreign nations.

I should therefore be inclined to assign the Ode to 29 B.C. or early in 28, while Augustus' intentions were still uncertain. The lines

militia simul
fessas cohortes abdidit oppidis,

fit this date, *abdidit* giving rather better meaning than *addidit*. The temple of Janus was still closed when Augustus returned.

It is rather a strain to take *dato* (line 41) as equivalent to *accepto*, and it seems rather silly to take it as meaning 'congratulate yourselves on having given it.' Surely it must mean 'rejoice when anyone else gives it,' the someone else being in this case Horace himself, who is here the intermediary between the Muses and Augustus. Certainly, to offer such advice to Augustus at such a time, Horace needed all his art to gild the pill, and might well begin with an apologetic introduction equal in length to the counsel he had to offer.

L. A. MACKAY.

University College, Toronto.

HORACE, EPISTLES, I. 2. 30-31.

cui pulchrum fuit in medios dormire dies et
ad strepitum citharae cessatum ducere somnum.

WHETHER or not *somnum*, the reading of Eg and presumably V, and the *curam* of most other manuscripts, represent independent traditions of equal antiquity, Dean Inge's article in C.R. XXXV. 103 suggests an interpretation that gives *somnum* rather more point than the admittedly unsatisfactory *curam*, which also involves a cackling alliteration much more Plautine than Horatian in effect.

Briefly, he points out, on the one hand, that the Phaeacians were unusually free from worries, and something more blameworthy is implied than soothing a care-burdened mind with music; on the other hand, that they did not pass their time in sodden sleep, but in pleasure (*Od.* VIII. 248-9), that anyway a *strepitus* is no aid to sleep, and that the natural development of the thought shows them turning day into night, and night into day. He therefore proposes to read *cessantem ducere noctem*.

But it is hard to see why this should ever have become *cessatum ducere somnum*, and Acron's note seems to imply

that he read *somnum*. It is possible however to get the required sense while retaining the reading of E, if we take *cessare* as in line 70 of this epistle to mean 'hang back, delay, dally,' and *ducere* in the sense of 'induce.' The translation will then be 'prevail on sleep to delay its coming,' exactly what we need.

I have not been able to find any other examples of *ducere* used in this sense with a supine. It seems always to retain the idea of physical motion. Somewhat similar however is the use of the supine with *vocare*, as in legal language (*Cic. Mur.* 26, *de Or.* I. 41; with *cieri*, *de Or.* I. 237), in Plautus (*Men.* 458, 835; *Stich.* 182) and in Terence (*Eun.* 443: *provocemus*). Compare also Sallust *Histories* (*Oratio Macri*) 16, *ultra licentiam in vos auctum atque adiutum properatis*; and 17, *neque ego vos ultum iniurias hortor*.

The most that can be said for these examples is that they establish the bare possibility that *ducere* might be used with a supine without stressing the idea of physical motion: the better balance and point of the translation is the chief

positive argument for it. I am indebted to Mr. Gilbert Norwood for the suggestion that if *cessatum ducere* can be accepted in this sense, the sort of con-

cealed oxymoron which it involves may be paralleled in *Od.* III. 6. 44, *tempus agens abeunte curru*. L. A. MACKAY.
University College, Toronto.

‘BYZANTIOS OLENT LACERTOS’ (Stat. S. 4, 9, 13).

THE poor book had fared very ill. It was old and worm-eaten; the grocer and the fishmonger had wrapped their wares in it; it stank of fish and other things besides; there was no mistaking the peculiar smell of Byzantine kippers! What fish was this whose very wrappings brought a whiff of the fishmarket in Byzantium?

The few classical references to the fish *lacertus* (in Statius, Pliny, Martial, Juvenal, Celsus and Apicius) tell us nothing by which we may identify it. Pretty well all they say is that it was a sea-fish; that it was pickled (Apicius), and none too digestible (Celsus); and that the cook wrapped it in bay-leaves or rather in rue, and served it with hard-boiled eggs (Juvenal). We are thrown back, as often happens, on the Italian fishmarkets, where many ancient words survive and keep in general their ancient meaning. *Lacertus*, then, is a name still in daily use in such forms as *lacierto*, *lanciardo*, *lanzardo*, in Trieste, Pola, Venice, Ancona, and other markets especially on the Adriatic coast: in all of these it means the fish which we call the Spanish mackerel, *Scomber colias*. Only here and there is it apt to be confused with *scombro*, the common mackerel, as at Genoa, Leghorn and Civita Vecchia.

From *lacertus*, *lacerto*, etc., we pass easily to *σαῦρος*, *saurus*, another common fish of which classical writers tell us little. Galen merely says that its meat is tender (*μαλακόσαρκος*) and moderately wholesome; and Oppian says that it is like the fish *τράχουρος*, save that the latter frequents sandy ground, while *σαῦρος* lives on a muddy bottom. But Xenocrates declares that these are but two names for one and the same fish—*τράχουροι*, οἱ πρὸς ἐνίῳν *σαῦροι* καλοῦμενοι.

As for the fish *τράχουρος*, it goes in shoals, *τραχούρων ἀγέλαι* (Opp. H. i.

99), or *ἔθνη τραχούρων* (iii. 399); and a scholiast says, on the former of these two passages, that it resembles ‘a tunny or a sardine’—*ὅμοια πηλαμύσιν, καὶ τῶν τριχαίων*. According to Belon *σαῦρος* is the generic word, and *τράχουρος* a species thereof; and the scholiast on Opp. H. i. 99 makes *λακέρδα* identical with *τράχουρος*—*τρ. ὅμοιον εἶναι φησι τῇ πηλαμύδι, παρ’ ἡμῖν δὲ λακέρδα καλούμενος*. But from one end of modern Italy to the other, from Trieste to Palermo, we find *saurus* in various dialectic forms, *sàuro*, *sauru*, *suro*, *sciuro*, *surella*, *sugharello*, always meaning (as do M. G. *σαυρίδι* and Fr. *sauvel*) one and the same fish, the horse-mackerel or scad, the *Scomber trachurus* of Linnaeus, *Trachurus trachurus* or *Caranx trachurus* of modern authors. It is undoubtedly the Greek *τράχουρος*. It belongs not to the true mackerels (*Scombridæ*) but to a closely related family (*Carangidæ*), and it is at once distinguished by a rough ridge of peculiar scales which runs down each side of body and tail. As a matter of fact there are one or two allied species, scarce and unimportant, such as *Caranx suareus*, Risso, in M. G. *σαυρίδι κυνηγός* or *κοκκάλι*; and of some such species or subspecies as this Oppian may have been thinking.

Next after *lacertus* and *saurus* we have the mackerel itself: *scomber* in Latin; *scombro*, *scombru*, *sgumro*, *stumno*, etc., in the Italian dialects; *σκόμβρος*, *σκούμπρι* in Greek.

Mackerel and Spanish mackerel (*lacertus*, *κολίας*) are much alike; but the *κολίας* has bigger eyes than the mackerel—they sometimes call it *occhi grossi* in southern Italy. It is still better characterised by a ‘corselet,’ or patch of rough scales, on the breast below the pectoral fin, and by certain greyish spots or stripes on the lower half of the body. The fisher-

men have no difficulty in distinguishing the two fishes, but ordinary eyes see little difference between them. Even Willughby, or John Ray his editor, says: 'Inter hunc piscem et Scombrum quod intersit, nihil aliud observari posse puto quam quod Colias magis parvus sit, quo praecipue salito uti solent.' The name *κολίας* survives as *kullia* at Bari; and *cavaglia* at Cagliari, and *cogniol* (? *κολιόν*) at Marseilles, are possibly the same word.

Our three fishes, mackerel, Spanish mackerel, and scad or horse-mackerel—*σκόμβρος* or *scomber*, *κολίας* or *lacertus*, *σαῦρος* or *trachurus*—are now identified.

The fisheries of the Black Sea and the Sea of Marmora are very rich but curiously limited. The Black Sea is deep, but its outlet to the Mediterranean is shallow; its circulation goes no deeper than the level of its entrance; its deeper waters stagnate for want of oxygen from the outer sea. Nothing lives at the bottom of this great inland sea, there is nothing down there but foul and fetid mud; but the surface waters teem with fish, so-called 'pelagic fishes,' tunnies, various sorts of mackerel, and of the herring family pilchard, anchovy and sprat. In Constantinople the tunny fishery is the greatest of all, and it was the same in old Byzantium, the common or red tunny (*Thynnus vulgaris*) and the pelamyd (*P. sarda*) being the principal species.¹ Next in importance comes the mackerel itself, for which the Turks have borrowed its Greek name *σκουμπρί*; of this valuable fish as many as 50 to 80 millions have been taken in the Bosphorus and Sea of Marmora in one spring fishing. Next in quantity, but much less in value, comes the Spanish (or Mediterranean) mackerel, *Sc. colias*, the 'Byzantine *lacertus*' of Statius. Of this fish a million kilos, more or less, come to the markets of Constantinople and neighbouring towns in a season, and these are worth about two million piastres. The Turks have a predilection for this fish which other nations do not share, and a great part even of the Spanish

catch is exported to Constantinople. Nearly all the catch is salted or pickled in various ways, with most of which we are not concerned. The livers are salted down, especially on the islands of the Sea of Marmora, and after further preparation are sold as 'garos,' a substance looking like anchovy sauce with an evil but appetising smell. Dr. E. Ehrenbaum (who has diligently studied the Turkish fisheries) believes it to be no other than the ancient *garum*; but the whole story of *garum*, even so far as Pliny relates it (XXXI. 42-44), is a long and difficult one.² It was made out of various kinds of fish, the anchovy being one of them. The best kind was made at Cartagena ('de succis piscis Iberi') from the *scomber* or mackerel: 'Expirantis adhuc scombri de sanguine primo Accipe fastosum munera cara garum' (Mart. 13. 102). But I doubt whether either Pliny or Martial was at pains to distinguish between *scomber* and *colias*, and Belon declares that in his time, in the middle of the sixteenth century, the Byzantines used both of these fishes for their *garum*. It is a manufacture which has never ceased from remote antiquity, and Artemidorus (*On*. I. 66) is perhaps not far wrong when he says: ἔστι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ὁ γάρος ἢ σηπεδών.

Apart from the *garum* which is or may be made from it, the Spanish mackerel has (so Ehrenbaum tells us) a strong and peculiar aroma of its own, provided it be caught and pickled in summer time; Apostolides speaks of a M.G. proverb — 'everything in its proper time, and *κολιός* in the month of August.' From September onwards it loses this aroma entirely and becomes worthless and unsaleable, unless indeed the autumn catch be mixed with some of the liver and entrails of the summer fish kept over for the purpose. This may be the point of Ulpian's remark 'lacerta cum muria sua.'

We come back to 'Byzantios olent

¹ Dr. E. Ehrenbaum, *Ueber die Seefischerei in den Osmanischen Gewässern*, in *Fischerbote* (Hamburg), IX., X., 1917-18.

² M. Köhler, *Τάριχος, ou recherches sur l'histoire et les antiquités des pêcheries de la Russie méridionale*, in *Mém. Acad. Imp. St. Pétersbourg*, (6) I., pp. 447-490, 1832 (on *garum*, see especially pp. 394-409). Cf. also Georg Eberl, *Die Fischkonserven der Alten*, 34 pp., Stadthamhof, 1892.

lacertos.' We have found *lacertus* to be the Spanish mackerel, a fish common and cheap in the fish market of Constantinople, notorious, when pickled, for its strong and penetrating odour or 'aroma.' It is no wonder that the very paper which it had been wrapped in should retain this peculiar and recognisable smell.

On our way we have met with the fish *τράχουπος*, and with the Scholiast who likened it to 'a tunny or a sardine.' The comparison seems useless and self-contradictory, but we must be in no hurry to reject it. For, like the other fish we have been dealing with, the horse-mackerel is related to, and is more or less like to, a tunny; so much so that, anywhere where the great

tunny-fish was a familiar object, to say that *scomber*, *lacertus* and *saurus* were each and all of them 'something like a tunny' would be the easiest and most natural of comparisons. But how can our *saurus* or *trachurus*, scad or horse-mackerel, be like both to a tunny and to a sardine? The young fry of the horse-mackerel are found in summer from Ireland to the Mediterranean in prodigious shoals—*τραχούρων ἀγέλαι*. These small fry look like sardines, and at Setubal (perhaps elsewhere for aught I know) they are caught in vast numbers, are bought up at a good price by the sardine-curers, and are used precisely like sardines.

D'ARCY WENTWORTH THOMPSON.
University of St. Andrews.

BEDE AND VEGETIUS.

IN collecting materials for an edition of Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*, I noticed that Bede was using the work of Vegetius, the fourth-century author of the *Epitoma Rei Militaris*. The italicised words in the following quotation from Vegetius 4. 35-6 (ed. Lang, pp. 152-3) appear in Bede, *D.T.R.* 28¹:

Observandum praecipue, ut a quintadecima luna usque ad vicesimam secundam arbores praecidantur, ex quibus liburnae contextendae sunt. His enim tantum octo diebus caesa materies immunis servatur a carie, reliquis autem diebus praecisa etiam eodem anno interna vermium labe exesa in pulverem vertitur, quod ars ipsa et omnium architectorum cotidianus usus edocuit et contemplatione ipsius religionis agnoscimus, quam pro aeternitate his tantum diebus placuit celebrari. Caeduntur autem trabes utiliter post solstitium aestivum, id est per mensem Iulium et Augustum et per autumnale aequinoctium [id est] usque in Kalendas Januarias. His namque mensibus arescente umore sicciora et ideo fortiora sunt ligna.

Later in Bede's treatise² the Greek word *rheuma* ('flood' or 'flow') is defined according to Vegetius' notion of *aestus* (*Res Milit.* 4. 42). Isidore (*Etym.* 4. 7. 11) had used the word only in the medical sense of *eruptio* or *fluor*.

Bede's debt to Vegetius has previously escaped notice because of the absence of Vegetius' name in all authentic works of Bede. Perhaps Bede

did not know the name of the author he was quoting; but he often concealed the source from which he drew if the orthodoxy of the source was questionable. No doubt his tendency will become evident when Bede's minor works have been properly edited. Further, no mention of Vegetius is found in the extant writings of the seventh and eighth centuries. Only at the height of the Carolingian Renaissance did his name and work become popular.³ Eighth-century scholars were

³ Cf. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* 1. 293-5, 320, 688. Hrabanus Maurus, who constantly relied upon Bede, Alcuin, and their Irish predecessors for his material, knew Vegetius. Sedulius Scotus 'like an uncharted comet' appeared on the Continent in the middle of the ninth century with a knowledge of Vegetius; cf. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe*, p. 202. In a catalogue of manuscripts at St. Gall, 841-872, Vegetius' *De Re Militari* is included (Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge* 1. 89). A Reichenau catalogue of the latter half of the ninth century also includes it (*ibid.* 1. 264). It is mentioned in two tenth-century catalogues of the library at Lorsch (Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, pp. 110, 124). St. Gall and Reichenau had a strong Irish tradition, and were especially rich in manuscripts of Bede's works. Lorsch was closely connected with Anglo-Saxon scholarship; cf. Lindsay, 'The (Early) Lorsch Scriptorium,' *Palaeographia Latina* 3(1924). 5-48. May we guess from these instances that Vegetius' work was preserved in Ireland, and came to the Con-

¹ Giles, *Beda Opera Omnia* 6. 200.

² Ch. 29 (Giles, *op. cit.*, 6. 201).

presumably not interested in military affairs.

Within certain limits we can date Bede's first knowledge of Vegetius. In *Retractationes in Acta* 28,¹ Bede says:

Scripsimus in libro primo, Isidorum sequentes, scapham esse naviculam levem ex vimine contextam crudoque corio tectam; verum deinceps aliorum scripta percurrentes invenimus scaphas vocari naviculas etiam una de arbore cavatas, quas *μωροφύλας* Graeci appellant.

This more recent information was taken from Vegetius 2. 25 (ed. Lang, p. 60), a passage which Bede obviously did not know at the time he composed *In Acta*, a work written, according to Plummer,² between the years 709 and 716. Some time between those years and the year 725, then, Bede began to read about military science. This criterion may help us to date more accurately certain of Bede's works.

Since the *Historia Ecclesiastica* was composed after 725, we might expect to find some trace of Vegetius in it. Collingwood, in his discussion of the writings on the subject of Hadrian's Wall,³ unconsciously called attention to a quotation from Vegetius made by Bede in his History:

Bede was a scholar and a scientist, an educated and trained mind such as we should expect in the leading intellect of the Anglian kingdom at the time of its most brilliant blossoming. Bede's *Chronicon sive de Sex Aetatibus Saeculi* is a compilation, and merely repeats Eusebius: but his *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* is history. Here he propounds a theory of the Wall or Walls based on three sources: Latin historians, Gildas, and archaeological knowledge of the remains. The crucial passage is a quotation from Orosius (not by name). Severus,

timid with Irish or English scholars? All the extant manuscripts are too late to provide a basis for judgment; cf. Lang, *Vegetius*, pp. xvi ff.

¹ Giles, *Beda Opera Omnia* 12. 155. Professor M. L. W. Laistner has collated the following passage with rotographs of the MSS. Vatican Reg. Lat. 708 (Saec. xiv?) and Vatican Pal. Lat. 287 (Saec. xii/xiii). In both manuscripts the Greek word is given in Latin letters (*monoxillas* and *monoxylas*). In Lang's text of Vegetius it is also in Latin letters (*monoxylis*).

² *Beda Opera Historica* 1. cxlvii.

³ R. G. Collingwood, 'Hadrian's Wall: A History of the Problem,' *Journal of Roman Studies* 11 (1921). 46-7. I retain Collingwood's italics.

says Bede, 'in Britannias defectu pene omnium sociorum trahitur, ubi magnis gravibusque proeliis saepe gestis receptam partem insulae a ceteris indomitis gentibus non muro ut quidam aestimant (italics mark Bede's own addition) sed vallo distinguendam putavit. Murus etenim de lapidibus, vallum vero, quo ad repellendam vim hostium castra muniuntur, fit de cespitibus; quibus circumcisis e terra velut murus extruitur altus supra terram ita ut in ante sit fossa de qua levati sunt cespites, supra quam sudes de lignis fortissimis praefiguntur. Itaque,' etc., continuing the quotation from Orosius (*H.E.* 1. 5).

Collingwood, of course, relied upon Plummer,⁴ who tried carefully to note all the extant sources for the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. But we already know enough of Bede's use of his material to feel that he was a learned and scholarly compiler, who much preferred to use the words of others whenever he could. It is dangerous to assert that any words in Bede's works were his own; it is less dangerous to say that, if we had all the materials with which Bede worked, we should find very few statements originating with him. The italicised words in the quotation above are a paraphrase, and in part a direct quotation, of Vegetius 1. 24 (ed. Lang, p. 26).

The Father of English History, then, had a fair theoretical background for appreciating the campaigns about which he wrote. Another 'Father'—the Father of English Printing—helped to introduce Vegetius' art of warfare to the English people when he printed his own translation of Christine de Pisan's adaptation of the *Epitoma Rei Militaris*.⁵

CHARLES W. JONES.

Oberlin College, U.S.A.

⁴ *Beda Opera Historica* 1. 16-7.

⁵ Christine de Pisan, *The Fayttes of Armes and of Chyvalrye*. Per Caxton. Compiled by Christine de Pisan from Vegetius, *De Re Militari*, etc. Translated by W. Caxton, July 14, 1489. Cf. Sayle, *Cambridge University Library, Early Printed Books* 1. 9.

According to MacCracken ('Vegetius in English,' *George Lyman Kittredge Anniversary Papers*, p. 390), the first English translation of Vegetius was made in the year 1408: 'It is remarkable, indeed, that the earliest known English translation should date from so late as 1408. The popularity of earlier French translations, still found in English libraries, may partly account for this delay.'

THE COST OF THE PROPYLAEA.

MODERN archaeologists are divided over the cost of the Periclean Propylaea into two camps: those who do and those who do not accept the tradition of Harpocraton s.v. Προπύλαια, thus: 'Ηλιόδωρος δ' ἐν α' περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνης ἀκροπόλεως μετ' ἑτέρα καὶ ταῦτά φησιν 'ἐν ἑτέροι μὲν ε' παντελῶς ἐξεπαίθη, τάλαντα δὲ ἀνῆλθον δισχιλία β'.' All the scholars who have accepted the tradition (namely Kirchhoff, *Abh. Berl. Ak.* 1876, 56; Wilamowitz, *Philolog. Untersuch.* I 210; E. Meyer, *Forsch. z. a. G.* II 99; Busolt III 493; Judeich, *Topog.* 79, and most recently Kolbe *Thuk. im Lichte der Urkunden* 80) have stated the total cost of building at 2,012 talents according to the text of Harpocraton. But the preservation in such a late and derivative quarter of so precise an amount is almost ridiculous. The β, which has been interpreted as the numeral 12, is a corruption of ς, the alternative way of writing δισχιλία, and Harpocraton has transmitted to us from Heliodorus just such a rough estimate of the cost of the Propylaea as Plutarch of the Parthenon (*Per.* 12): ἑκατὶ χιλιοστάριος.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES.

I. IN *De Iside et Osiride* 360b Plutarch records a Phrygian word in the following passage: Φρύγες δὲ μέχρι νῦν τὰ λαμπρὰ καὶ θαυμαστά τῶν ἔργων Μανικά καλοῦσι διὰ τὸ Μάνην τινὰ τῶν πάλαι βασιλέων ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ δυνατὸν γενέσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὃν ἔνιοι Μάσδην καλοῦσι. Among the ἔργα θαυμαστά of Phrygia none are more imposing than the rock-tombs, and it is tempting to suppose that these are referred to here under the name Μανικά. If that is so, it seems reasonable to connect the word, which no doubt owes its actual form to Greek popular etymology, with the form μανκα, which occurs frequently in Neo-Phrygian and is generally agreed to mean

'tomb.' If this suggestion is justified, the evidence of Plutarch may be used to support the view that the language of the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions was in vernacular use. The derivation from Manes, though that is a Phrygian name, is no doubt fanciful.

II. In a text from Badinlar (Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics*, No. 46) a worshipper records his punishment by the God ἐπεὶ ἠθέλησα μῆνε μετὰ γυνεὸς. According to Ramsay it was the rule that during service as *iepoi* married persons should separate, and Steinleitner, *Die Beicht* etc., p. 88, appears to share this view. The offence, as we should expect from the analogy of other inscriptions of this type, was more specific. Like *manere* in late Latin (v. Schopf, *Die konsonantischen Fernwirkungen*, p. 93) *μένειν* in late Greek had the sense of *concombere*, which suits the context here. This meaning may have been latent in the word from an early date; cf. *Odyssey* V 227:

Τερπέσθην φιλότῃ, παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες.

A. CAMERON.

University of Aberdeen.

A LINE OF THE IAMBI OF CALLIMACHUS.

IN the scholia to the *Iambi* of Callimachus (P.S. I. 1094) the scribe regularly employs the high single point for the purpose of dividing a lemma from its gloss. He uses the double point (colon) only twice, and is presumably consistent. In the first instance it separates a previous gloss from a new lemma in the middle of the line (l. 36—διὰ μέσον : λῶιστε : βέλτιστε). In the second instance, therefore (l. 39—)ον : λευκάς ἡμέρας), we may with confidence assume λ. ἡ. to be a lemma, and restore the line as several scholars have proposed : θεοί τε λευκάς ἡμέρας ἐπιστάνται (= ἐφίστανται?).

The passages concerned are on p. 274 of the Loeb text.

H. J. M. MILNE.

British Museum.

REVIEWS

CREATIVE HISTORY.

A Study in Creative History. By O. E. BURTON, M.A. (N.Z.). Pp. 320, 8vo. London: Allen and Unwin, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THE intention of this book is admirable, to display 'the interaction of the eastern and western peoples to 500 B.C.' in the fashion made popular lately by Schneider's *History of World Civilization*. But the author should have made up his mind whether interaction occurred, or not. For on p. 312 he arrives at the conclusion that 'the period before

500 B.C. is predominantly one of preparation in comparative isolation': 'tendencies and influences' of great importance later 'had hardly commenced to weave themselves into the warp and woof of history' (p. 313); 'the influence of Greek thought was unfelt outside Greece' (p. 291); and as his chapter on Rome ends with the establishment of the Republic, one wonders why it has been included at all. Similarly, after deliberately excluding Assyria along with 'Cnossus' on p. 9, he

insists on p. 304 that 'Assyria and Babylon developed the first great imperialisms of history,' and their influence was not by any means limited to military and political matters. It is, no doubt, difficult to draw any terminal lines in writing universal history; but the year 500 B.C. is not a very happy one. Aeschylus ranks rather with the first than the second Isaiah; and pre-Socratic Greece hardly ends even with Socrates.

Nor is the execution adequate to the design. Egypt is dismissed in twelve pages; crowded, it is true, with miscellaneous facts; but the two possible dates for the Exodus are confused (p. 21); it 'took place towards the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty (circa 1450 B.C.);' the Hyksos are 'wandering tribes of Semites who may have served as mercenaries in the Nubian wars' (p. 20); Egypt had 'three harvests a year' (p. 298); Herodotus is quoted with confidence on a number of points; and St. Stephen on Moses. Phoenician culture is freely illustrated from the Phaeacia of the *Odyssey* (p. 33).

The conspectus of the religious development of Israel, on the other hand, is critical and full—essentially from Peake's *Commentary*, with cross references to Driver's *Introduction*—and the personalities of the earlier prophets are well brought out. But more allowance might have been made for the topical setting of the second Isaiah, for whom Cyrus, 'the servant of the Lord,' was a contemporary, if the date assigned is right. But there are some oddities;

'Sidonese,' 'Cimmeranians' (p. 43), 'Bathsheeba' (p. 62), 'Pterir' (p. 128). In the chapter on Zoroaster it is a mistake to regard the worship of saints derived from older cults as peculiar to Roman Catholicism (p. 160). The Indian chapter is made tedious and unwieldy by vain repetitions of the doctrines of the Upanishads, and there is a strange reference to the 'muster-rolls of the *Odyssey*' (p. 166). On China, full credence seems to be given to the *Shuh King* for early history, and the account of Taoism does not substantiate the importance assigned to this school alongside that of Confucius (p. 265).

The Greek chapter is quite inadequate; Herodotus, Grote, and Schlegel are principal authorities; there are archaic allusions to 'Caucasian homelands' (p. 266) and 'fresh tribes from the Danube' (p. 281); Greece was 'the nucleus of Europe' (p. 278), and there is an odd speculation about a 'Hellenised Troy' (p. 278); and the spelling is reckless—Milotus, Halicarnuss, Miniae, Harmos, Glauco, Eleusian, Alkmann. Hêrê at Olympia (p. 288) seems meant for Heracles. Other novelties are 'brass alloyed with tin' (p. 276), 'stag-eyed Juno' in the *Iliad* (p. 270), and Poseidon as husband of Aphrodite (p. 275).

Frankly, with these shortcomings this essay is not safely to be recommended to the general reader.

J. L. MYRES.

New College, Oxford.

RELATIVITY IN TERMS OF PLACE.

Relative Ortsbezeichnung. Zum geographischen Sprachgebrauch der Griechen und Römer. Von Dr. H. STÜRENBURG. Pp. 44. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Paper, RM. 2.80.

THIS is a valuable treatise. It presents the results of a life-long study, based on wide reading, of a problem which has puzzled all attentive students of classical literature—the use of 'relative' terminology in geographical and topographical descriptions in Greek and Roman writers. 'Upper' and 'lower,'

'hither' and 'thither,' 'outer' and 'inner' and similar terms still—in spite of the existence of a more exact terminology—survive in modern European languages; for the Greeks and Romans *ὑπέρ* and *ὑπό*, *ἄνω* and *κάτω*, *hinc* and *illinc*, *citra* and *ultra* and the like were the ordinary stock-in-trade of all writers, professed geographers included. Dr. Stürenburg collects such expressions from a wide range of authors, and subjects them to an acute analysis.

His method will be exemplified by his section on 'upper and lower (up and down) without distinction of height.' He comments on the interesting fact that—alongside of the use of *ἄνω* and *κάτω* κτλ. to describe the interior as opposed to the coast of a particular country, e.g., Asia or Libya, and the nautical use of the verbs *ἀνάγεσθαι* and *κατάγεσθαι*, which has an obvious explanation—*ἄνω* and *κάτω*, *καθύπερθε* and *ὑπέπερθε* had an absolute value, established as early as Homer (*Il.* xxiv. 544 f., *Od.* iii. 170 ff.) and consecrated by Ptolemy, in the sense of 'north' and 'south.' The occurrence of this use in Homer carries it back beyond the age of maps, which to the post-Anaximandrian Greeks, as to us, made it natural and easy to say 'up north' and 'down south.' Dr. Stürenburg is inclined to seek the explanation of this quaint use in the actual configuration of the northern coast of the Mediterranean, with its high mountain-ranges, as op-

posed to the southern coast—the Greeks said 'up north' because in the north peaks on peaks arise. This is not very satisfying; it leaves us wondering whether, say, the Redskins or the Maoris or the Irish said 'up north' before they were introduced to maps. But that is the sort of enquiry that Dr. Stürenburg's work is always suggesting.

On p. 32, I think he has missed a point. He quotes *στόμα Δίρκας* from Eur. *Hipp.* 556 as an instance of *στόμα* applied to the source of a river as opposed to, e.g., in ore *Tiberis Ostia urbs condita*. But surely it is the mouth of the spring, not the source of the stream that is in question here? True, they are the same thing, yet Dr. Stürenburg himself teaches us to feel how different they are.

It would be difficult to find 44 pages so full of learning, wisdom and gentle humour.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

ECCE ITERVM MEGARENSIS.

Theognis. Von F. JACOBY. Pp. 93. (Sonderausgabe aus den Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, *Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1931, X.) Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931. Paper, RM. 6.

PROFESSOR JACOBY's main conclusions about the *Theognidea* are as follows:

Theognis wrote ll. 1-4 and 11-18, and most of the pieces which contain *Κύρνε* or *Πολυπαῖδη*, his 'seal'; if he wrote anything else that we have, it must have lost its seal or be a relic of a poem that was sealed. His book was conceived and executed as a unity, and published as 'a closed book' complete in itself. That book, of which we have only part,¹ began as our text begins except that 5-10 are not his, and for some way on the poems are in good sequence; 237-254 were its end; and in that book, between that beginning and that end, was comprised every poem of his, whatever its place in our text. What we have of it shows that he was

of the Nisaeen Megara, but reveals little else of his life, not even that he engaged in politics or ever left his city either as exile or as traveller. Of older poets after Homer he used Solon, but perhaps no other, not even Hesiod. We cannot date him by what we know of Megarian history, but his use of Solon gives an upper limit, and the traditional *floruit*, the 59th Olympiad, however it was determined, may be near the truth.

Our Book I incorporates also a gnomic book by a later Megarian, and we have its proem in 757-92, wherein are the two pieces that mention the Medes, referring to the great invasion of Greece. He used *Theognis* and *Mimnermus*.

Of this second Megarian's book the end is missing; but its proem comes immediately after the envoi of yet another gnomic book, 753-756. He wrote those lines perhaps wrote also 5-10, which were designed for their present place and were part of a deliberate and systematic enlargement, for an Athenian public, of the book addressed to Kyrnos. Not that book,

¹ 'Nur Fetzen' (p. 145); but he does not mean 'nur Fragmente' (p. 102, n. 3; p. 157, n. 1) or 'versprengte Reste' (p. 113).

but the expansion, was known in the fourth century as Theognis; to Plato, for example, who quotes as from him not only 33-36, of which the first couplet is an interpolation contradicting the poem upon which it was foisted, but also lines from the unsealed poem 429-438.

Book II has its proem and envoi; ὦ παῖ serves more or less as its 'seal'; and in spite of alien matter the unity of the book can be seen. So much of it as is original may well be of the fifth century.

In maintaining these opinions, and in his further speculations on the processes which brought about our text, the author deals with almost every aspect of the Theognidean Question. He promises a sequel, but already he has supplied much valuable commentary, especially upon 1-38, which are set out with critical apparatus and rendered into rough verse.

His manners are as rough as his verse. He talks throughout with a blustering assurance which thrives on the sound of its own voice. He is disdainful of 'die Philologen,' as if his trade were other than theirs. Above all he plumes himself on the rigour of his thought, of which a specimen may be given: ll. 5-10, which are called for a poor reason¹ 'vermutlich' Attic on p. 132, become for no further reason 'offenbar' Attic by p. 155, and 'nachweisbar' Attic on p. 176.

Such rodomontade would better have becomed a smaller man; for this is an able work, and its case could not have been much more tellingly put. It has led me back to my youthful venture of thirty years ago. Perhaps I may go into the whole Question again, however

different the answer may now come out. Meanwhile here are a few criticisms, limited by want of space to the larger issues, and to those points of vantage to which the author ascribes the speed and depth of his penetration into No Man's Land.

Κύρνε, σοφιστομένῳ μὲν ἔμοι σφρηγὶς ἐπικεῖσθω
τοῖσδ' ἔπειν, λήσσει δ' οὐποτε κλεπτόμενα.

Everyone who approaches the Theognidean Question must be tempted at first to take Κύρνε and Πολυπαίδη as the poet's 'seal'; but second thoughts must give him pause. To include one of these vocatives in every poem would be no safeguard against thief or coiner, since Κύρνε can often be removed or inserted.² 'The poet can't have thought of that' (p. 120, n.). 'Ἦν ἄρ' οὐκ ἄγαν σοφός. And a man so 'subtle' should have been subtle enough to refrain from two vocatives in a short³ piece, such as 69-72, where the second serves neither the supposed purpose nor any other, lest he should seem to have sown Κύρνε from the sack. Nor should he have left his subtlety obscure. Jacoby sees that readers may have been in doubt at first, but thinks that reading on, and finding poem after poem with its Κύρνε or Πολυπαίδη, they would tumble to it at last. But the subtlety seems to have eluded Critias and the author of our latest Epicharmea, whose echoes of the σφρηγὶς couplet suggest that they took the seal to be the announcement of the poet's name.

Wherein then lay the subtlety? Before we can be sure that there was any, we must ascertain the meaning of the couplet. 'Kyrnos, ich habe einen klugen Einfall (habe mir dies ausgedacht): ein Siegel soll diese Verse vor Diebstahl schützen' (p. 112). This paraphrase is open to the same objection as Sitzler's 'callido (vel potius callide agenti) mihi sigillum impressum esto hisce versibus': 'callidus imprimam' is very well, but anything comparable to 'callide mihi agenti impressum esto' is still to seek, and until that syntax has been substantiated it will remain doubtful.

² As in 156 by the source of Stobaeus, in 213 by the worse MSS.

³ In a longer piece, such as 183-192, the second vocative near the end has its value.

¹ Because they describe Apollo's birth in Delos, and Megara had not such relations with Delos as Athens had (p. 107). That the interpolation is 'vermutlich' Attic, and Attica is nearer to the Isthmus than to Sicily, is but a feeble 'confirmation' of the reasons for assigning the poet to the Nisaeon Megara (p. 132).—His comparison of this poem and its neighbours with the Attic skolia, which among three quatrains addressed to deities have a prayerless quatrain on the birth of Apollo and Artemis, seems to miss the mark. Nor is it noteworthy that those skolia have four lines each; that is the way of quatrains.

ful what σοφίζομένῳ means,¹ and which δέ (if any) in the sequel answers to the μέν.²

As in the 'end-poem' 237-254 the poet claims to have made Kyrnos immortal, so in the poem which first names Kyrnos he claims for himself world-wide renown.³ On what rested that claim? Doubtless on his poetry, especially if he was a stay-at-home; but on what poetry? Not on the Kyrnos book; his renown is older than its publication, as οὐπω shows.⁴ On Kyrnos poems already known? Scarcely, if the book was 'conceived and executed as a unity.' Then perhaps on other poems, or another book, or other books.

The train of thought in the early part of our text has been well elucidated by Friedländer, who reckons as indispensable to the sequence a couplet (153 f.) differing by two words only from one of Solon's, and takes it as proof that Theognis took over 'selbst geformtes Gut.'⁵ Jacoby, though he must discard that couplet, for it is 'unsealed,' regards the sequence of the poems as good between his beginning and his end of the Kyrnos book. Now most of the Kyrnos poems either give counsel or decry the rotten state of Megara, but some of them do neither: 1197-1202 express the poet's sorrow for the loss of his fields, 549-554 are a sketch of incident and movement. How did they fit in? Jacoby sees the problem but gives it up (p. 159). Indeed there can have

been no good place for them in his book 'conceived and executed as a unity,' 'a closed book.'

Jacoby is very sure that the Kyrnos book originally ended with 237-254; not with 237-252. The last scholar⁶ who thought so repented, and performed upon the poem the 'Beschneidung' which Jacoby scorns (p. 153). Unshorn of its final couplet, the poem makes the book end on a note of disappointment and reproach for which no 'sealed' poem shows cause.⁷ But Jacoby is to maintain his παρά προσδοκίαν 'in another connexion' (p. 155). We must wait and see.

Equally positive is Jacoby that 753-756 were once the end of a book. But they purport to sum up the lesson 'Make money justly,' which may have furnished a string of gnomes but hardly much of a book. Except as a quatrain differs from a couplet, they are comparable to 37 f., which end a poem but not a book.

This 'end' is followed by a 'beginning.' That 757-792 are a proem Jacoby stoutly affirms. We have here, between the two petitions to gods which mention the Medes, a quatrain on the poet's office; that looks prefatory, but the poems on either side of it have things prefatory to good cheer and good will, indeed, but nothing prefatory to a book unless ἡμέτερον in 760 means 'my,' as Jacoby without warrant assumes (p. 99).⁸ *Non liquet.*

Proem or not, they take a different tone from 19-38: but it is not unknown that a disgruntled citizen, in times of foreign peril, should wish his city well.

If proem they are, we cannot say to what, for we have not yet any criterion for assigning other pieces to their poet. Jacoby thinks him the man who by 'unavoidable' alterations adapted 39-42, 53-60, 213-218 to the Megara of his day and so gave us 1081-2b, 1109-14,

⁶ Or the last that I know of. See C.R., XXVI (1912), p. 46.

⁷ Not 1177 f., unless we take Edmonds's view of the optatives. Not necessarily 1103 f., unless Jacoby, like Edmonds, accepts my junction of 1101-4. Not 411-414, unless my more doubtful junction is right. In 371 f. the affection of Kyrnos for the poet is only too strong.

⁸ The singular γλώσσαν does not prove it; see 85, 421, 1163, Soph. O.C. 1052, etc.

¹ Jacoby's objections (p. 114) to my suggestion take a narrow view of σοφός and of verbs of the σοφίζεσθαι class. See, for example, κακίζόμενον, 'acting like a κακός,' in II. xxiv, 214.

² In the 'end-poem' 237-254, σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ is answered loud and clear by αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὀλίγησ παρὰ σεῦ.—It is not true that δ' in 27 has always been ignored. Its needs are satisfied by 23-26.—Jacoby's insensitiveness to the force of these particles is betrayed by his misquotation from 63 on p. 144.

³ Equally so whether πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός be given to πᾶς τις or not; that turns on the text of 24. Jacoby's reason for thinking that the words *must* be so given is refuted by 'That's Shell—that was!' By the way, when he says (p. 116) that I regard 'ἀπορροισιν γ' οὐπω' as 'Überlieferung,' his statement is as false as his accentuation; see pp. 2 and 230 of my book.

⁴ But the whole line would show it even if οὐπω meant 'nowise.'

⁵ *Hermes* 48 (1913), p. 589.

1071-4 (p. 157). 'Unavoidable' is much to say. Compare 213-218 with 1071-4. Had the polyp, or Megara's knowledge of its habits, died out before Xerxes came? And why did this adapter leave in the 'seal,' or introduce it (for in 213 not Κύρνε but Θυμέ is the reading of the best MS.)?

Professor Jacoby remarks that a thorough study of the metre and language of the Theognidea is wanted. His misquotations *ἦν τι περισσόν | εἰδείη* (p. 99) and *οἶδε Συρακουσίους* (p. 137) suggest that here 'die Philologen' may do better than he, and Mr. J. M. Edmonds has already made a fresh start on this work in the preface of his *Elegy and Iambus*. Not all the distinctions there drawn between the *Κύρνε-Πολυπαῖδη* poems and the rest are of value. Since the *ΚΠ* poems have *κατέτριβον, πατρός, ἀφνεόν, ἀλλότριον, κέκριται, ἀγρούς*, and several final vowels scanned short before an initial pair of mute and liquid, it is no matter that they have none of the eight instances of a vowel scanned short before *φρ*. His figures for 'anapaestic' rhythm in the second half of the pentameter are dubious, and the criterion is not instructive by itself since the hemistich in such a case usually begins (as in *τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔχειο*) with what students of these matters call a prospective or prepositive word. The statistics of masculine caesura in the third foot of the hexameter, and of vowels shortened in *hiatu*, seem to yield little; and 93-100 and 457-460 should not be dubbed 'late' because of their 'trochaic' shortenings *τοῖ* and *ἀγκυραῖ* in the second foot, for a *ΚΠ* poem has *καί* so placed in a hexameter (183) and another probably has *χρη* in a pentameter (806). But he seems to have established that the *ΚΠ* poems are comparatively fond of *νῦ ἐφελκυστικόν* 'making position,' as in *ἔπεσιν λήσει*, and loth to elide at the diaeresis of the pentameter unless the elided word is *δέ* or *τε*; and though the statement that the *ΚΠ* poems use only *-η* in the second person singular of the middle is erroneous, for the first or second of them has *μαθήσεται*, there is much of service in his study of words and forms.

Towards the solution of the problem of the genesis of our collection Edmonds contributes the opinion that there are 'clear traces of at least one source which was arranged according to the initial letter,'¹ both *Ο* and *Ω* being written *Ο*. Every editor must have noticed some of the sequences of the same initial letter, but I do not remember that anyone has argued from them. Even if we deny Edmonds his equation of *Ο* and *Ω*, his text gives the following runs of more than two: *ΠΠΠΠ* in 73-82, *ΟΟΟ* in 131-144, *ΠΠΠ* in 419-428, *ΟΟΟΠΠΠ* in 611-624, *ΠΠΠ* in 825-836, *ΟΟΟ* in 1161-1164, *ΟΟΟ* in 1197-1208, *ΩΩΩ* in 1257-1266, *ΩΩΩ* in 1283-1304. Of these last two runs I say no more, for they are supplied by the recurrent **Ω παῖ* of Book II; but the runs of *Π* and *Ο* in Book I are not to be poohpoohed.

Besides *Π* and *Ο* (and *Ω*) Edmonds's own brief statement of his case brings into play no other letter except *Μ* and *Ν*. Now initial *Μ* is instructive: it is disproportionately frequent, occurring 33 times in 362 poems, but in every single instance after the first it belongs to *Μή* or a compound of *Μή*, the dehortatory negative in which a gnomology abounds. Can the 44 *Π*'s and the 73 *Ο*'s be similarly explained? To some extent. Of the *Ο*'s no less than 51 belong to *οὐ, οὐκ, οὐ-*, and many of them open sentences of a moralizing and generalizing cast: 'Never did . . .', 'Nothing is better than . . .', 'No man . . .'. Of the *Π*'s, again, many are due to the moralist's love of 'Many,' 'Few,' 'Often,' 'Seldom,' 'Wealth.' The conditions, then, are favourable to casual runs of *Μ* or *Ο* or *Π*. Whether it can be due to chance that nevertheless there is no good run of *Μ*, or of *Α* or *Ε* or any other common initial, *videant mathematici*. (What are the chances that four consecutive Odes of Horace should begin with *Δ*, as in IV 5-8?) My present feeling is that part of what Edmonds has observed is due to chance, and the rest to connexion of thought, particularly in 73-82, where we must pay heed to *π*'s as well as *Π*'s:

¹ Such an arrangement as we see, for example, in *Anth. Pal. V. 103-132, VI. 87-108*.

Πρῆξιν - πᾶσι - παῦροι - πολλῶν πιστὸν-
 Παύροιςιν πίσυρος - Πιστὸς - Παύρους-
 πιστοὺς - πρήγμασι. But my mind is
 open, and Edmonds is to be thanked
 for bringing an interesting question to
 light.

So here are things to think on. The
 Theognidean Question will survive even
 unto generations that know not Jacoby.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

PORSON'S LAW.

Beiträge zur Lex Porsoniana. Dr. FRANZ
 XAVER BILL. Pp. 104. Emsdetten
 (Westphalia): printed by H. and J.
 Lechte, 1932. Paper.

To those of us who were taught in
 youth to make Greek trimeters of our
 own, Porson's Law is second nature.
 Perhaps we hold it in too great awe,
 for the imitative composer fights shy of
 the rare and dubious. We look askance
 not only at Ἀριόμαρδος Σάρδεσιν and
 νότοις οὐρανόν, in which no scholar can
 have perfect faith, but also at endings
 which the present fashion of doctrine
 allows. Such are ἀλλὰ ψεύσεται (*And.*
 346) and οὐδὲ ψάυομεν (*Hec.* 729), which
 Dr. Bill and others, rightly in my
 opinion, bring within their form of the
 Law as close word-groups, differing
 only in that the first word is a di-
 syllable from καὶ ψεύσεται and οὐ
 ψάυομεν. Other endings now tolerated
 are those in which the cretic follows
 elision. Dr. Bill gives a list of ten
 tragic trimeters where that is so, and
 we may add *S. El.* 413 and (if indeed
 Porson's reading is right) *E. fr.* 362, 2.
 In nine of those twelve lines the elision
 is between a verb and ἄν, in one it is
 due to the subterfuge νότοις οὐρανόν:
 but ἡγεῖτ' οἴκοθεν (*Aj.* 1101) and σήμαιν'
 εἴτ' ἔχει (*Phil.* 22) stand apart. Though
 I agree that they may be sound, it is
 partly because a welding power of elision
 seems needed to account for other
 things in tragic versification which are
 not treated in this book.

From the tragic Triad Dr. Bill turns
 to the *Rhesus*, which dutifully obeys
 'LP' (he need not have suggested ἐπεὶ
 πέρ σοι δοκεῖ for ἐπεὶ περ σοι δοκεῖ in
 868); then to Lycophron, whose re-
 markable treatment of the fifth foot he
 fails to bring out. In the weary length
 of the *Alexandra* there are just about as
 many fifth spondees as fifth iambs, and
 apart from the freakish reading ἐκ

ῥύσεται in 191 not one of those spondees
 is divided at all.

After something on satyric and mock-
 tragic trimeters the author passes to
 the *Begründung* of the Law.

Porson did not claim to have ex-
 hausted the subject of caesura of the
 fifth spondee, nor has it been exhausted
 since. One question in particular seems
 to have escaped attention. In some
 spurious passages the cretic is preceded
 by a monosyllable not of what is called
 the prospective or prepositive kind, as
 in ὅστις ἂν γ' ἢ νουνεχής (*E. fr.* 1132).
 Compare

postquam relictis moenibus rex procidit (*Hor.*
Epod. xvii. 13).

In several trimeters of Greek tragedy
 a slight change will give the like:

ἐξ οὗτε τιμὴν τήνδ' ἀναξ Ζεὺς ὤπασεν (*cf. A. Pers.*
 762),
 ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς Ἑκτορος χεῖρ ἤνασεν (*cf. Rhes.*
 762).

Other such endings are easy to make:
 γῆ Λημνία, ποὺς ἐσφάλη, δρᾷ δεσπότης,
 φύς βάρβαρος. Why were they avoided?
 Porson did not say; and so long as
 that question is open we cannot ascer-
 tain what instinct lies behind the Law.
 But the topic of cause or origin has
 been broached by Král and by Witte,
 whose 'promising attempt' is known
 both to others and to readers of Hardie's
Res Metrica (p. 75). Dr. Bill has taken
 the same line of approach, and I have
 followed him with interest. Certainly
 caesura of the fifth foot must be con-
 sidered in relation to caesura of the
 third or fourth. But it is a pity that
 he has treated caesurae only, and not
 those stronger divisions which we
 denote by stops.

The little new that he has to say
 about tragic use is preliminary to his
 'theme proper,' the applicability of

'LP' to non-dramatic verse, beginning with Archilochus. Here he is on the quicksands of bad texts. Nothing can be drawn from the 'trimeter' *σαλευ(ο)-μένη κορώνη ὥσπερ κηρύλος*, which like many another fragment of Greek poetry is a crow in halcyon's feathers; or from Solon's 'tetrameters'

μη[δε] συγχείας παντάσσι καὶ ταρξας τὴν
πόλιν—
καὶ [υ-] διαρμόσασθαι πρὸς τὸ ἄριστον [τὴν
πόλιν],

where the crasis gives an unmetrical *ā*: but in fact these words are Plutarch's prose, which it takes a Diehl to rearrange thus as verse. Indeed Dr. Bill has not a safe ear, for he entertains the thought of *ὄνλ* in *τρόπον γυναικὸς χρηστὸν ἔδνον λαμβάνειν*. He fancies that 'LP' does not hold for the Epode trimeters of Archilochus. It seems to hold; but if only our remains of his Epodes were more copious we should doubtless find breaches: as who should say that, if only there were more pigs, some of them might fly. Still, this part of his work will be of use to anyone who wishes to survey the iambic metre from first to last.

The chief value of the book lies in its careful study of 'LP' in such Latin iambs as copy the quantitative pattern of the Greek. The Latins' liking for cretic ends, and the relations between the main caesurae and the cretic, are exhibited in tabular form. There is less room for such interplay in a dimeter, and Dr. Bill shows well, after Leo, that Horace reckes less of 'LP' in dimeters than in trimeters. The continuous trimeters of *Epod.* xvii conform to the letter of the law, though 'rex procidit' (see above) and 'mens et sonus' give us pause, and even *ἡγεῖτ' οἴκοθεν* is not a full precedent for the Senecan rhythm of

alitis atque canibus homicidam Hectorem
inasmuch as the elision follows a trisyllabic foot. This poem does not

show so clearly to me as it does to Dr. Bill that Horace 'knew the Law.'

That in Seneca the fourth syllable from the end of the trimeter is almost always long, and that cretic endings are frequent, is familiar. Dr. Bill has classified the cretic endings of the *Troades*, including few lines that are not to the point, and omitting only ll. 191 and 627. The play proves to have over a hundred instances of elision between a hypermonosyllable and the cretic, and six lines in which (as in 'astus callidos') the cretic follows an unelided hypermonosyllable. The evidence of the other plays agrees pretty well. Seneca then does not sedulously avoid *νότοις οὐρανόν*, but he has a positive liking for *ἡγεῖτ' οἴκοθεν* and 'homicidam Hectorem.' And why? Dr. Bill makes approaches to an answer, but no more.

He shows that the trimeters of the *Apocolocyntosis* are Senecan in style. What is more important, he shows that the *Octavia*, with plenty of the elisive type, has not a single ending to match 'astus callidos.' That certainly tells against Seneca's title to the play.

The sketch of Porson's life with which the book ends is well enough done. We read that 'aus Anlass seines Eintritts in die Craven-University' (as a candidate for the Craven Scholarship) he wrote seventeen Greek iambs 'ohne Akzente, aber mit der Pause, wie er selbst das Gesetz nannte, das er später entdeckte.' If the meaning is that they conformed to Porson's Law, that is not so, for here are the eighth and ninth of them:

Ἐκουσαν ἐζήτησε Μουσάν· Χρηστοτης τ'
Ἐγέλα παραστὰς· αἶν' ἐκαστης ἐνθαδε—

The book lacks proof-correction, witness this sentence about Horace (p. 63): 'Im Verse des Lucilius lehnt er die "mora pedestris" ab (Sat. II 6, 17) und die "sermones repentēs per humum" (Sat. II 1, 250).'

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE BUDÉ REPUBLIC.

Platon, *Œuvres Complètes*. Tome vi. *La République*, Livres i.-iii. Texte établi et traduit par ÉMILE CHAMBRY, avec introduction d'AUGUSTE DIÈS. Pp. cliv. + 278. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 30 fr.

M. Diès' introduction to the Budé *Republic* is a most readable piece of work; graceful, clear, and concise; and, while touching upon various incidental points of interest and controversy (critical, chronological, historical), nevertheless holds fast to its main theme. It gives, in fact, an excellent outline of the whole of the *Republic*, together with many useful observations. Chief among the incidental discussions is that of the unity of the *Republic*, and the date of its composition, which Diès places provisionally at 375 as against certain modern scholars. Useful bibliographies are provided for the whole *Republic*, and for Greek mathematical developments, as well as a table showing the divisions of the dialogue and their relative lengths. In his account of the Line in Book vi., it is not clear whether M. Diès intends to allow the class of *μαθηματικά*, distinct from the Forms themselves, as the third class of objects; the impression given is, I think, that he does not. Another point in the same context which, as made in passing, sounds strange, is the statement that Theaetetus discovered that there are magnitudes 'of which the squares themselves are irrational.' Readers of the *Theaetetus* who are not familiar with Euclid x. may well be puzzled by this, but it may induce them to read some Euclid.

In his text M. Chambry is a close follower of A, for the most part, perhaps closer than Burnet. At the same time he claims to have provided a complete record of the readings of F. But he does not hesitate on occasions to depart from the MS. readings. In his translation he is, wherever I have read him, careful and finished, and shows the advantages which a translator has in working in a language with the traditions and methods of French—above all, he

is able to prevent his work from having too much of the air of a translation. Yet this in itself has obvious drawbacks. If French has, as it were, its own colour scheme, then some of the colour of the original must be altered or lost, and this can be seen happening in such changes as the following: *ἐξαγγέλλεις*, 382e, addressed to Cephalus as an old man, who may have some tidings to impart of old age, becomes 'tu as autre chose à en dire'; *σχολῇ*, 354a, becomes 'encore moins'; *δεσπότης ἀγρίους ἀφομοιωθῶσιν*, 416b, 'ils . . . deviennent des maîtres sauvages.' Again, we find the same word or phrase variously translated, where no advantage seems to accrue from doing so: for instance, *πόλις*, 'notre Etat' (378b), 'notre république' (378d); *τρυφῶσαν*, 'qui vit dans les délices' (372e), but when referred to at 399e, *ἦν ἄρτι τρυφᾶν ἔφαμεν*, 'nous avons . . . purifié la cité de la mollesse dont nous disions naguère qu'elle était infectée.' And even the great phrase *αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ* is varied: 'par elle(s)-même(s)', 358b; 'en elle-même et pour elle-même', 358d. But I fancy that the translation in the first of these two passages is influenced by the way in which *τίνα ἔχει δύναμιν* is taken. Most probably this is almost synonymous with the preceding *τί ἐστι*, but M. Chambry translates: 'les effets que l'une et l'autre produisent dans l'âme.' As a type of the minor felicitous touches in the translation take the following: *ρενμάτων καὶ πνευμάτων*, 405d, 'd'humeurs et de vapeurs.' For the greater effects, the translation itself must be read.

The notes to the translation are partly annotations, partly summaries, and some deal with textual points. Some of them, coming after M. Diès' introduction, seem unnecessary, and I doubt whether the work really gains much from them. Occasionally one is bound to dissent from their sentiments—as the suggestion that in 349-350 Plato does not quite know what he is about ('ici encore Platon est plus près des Sophistes qu'il ne pense,' etc.); and surely the suggestion at 331b that Socrates' words at the end of the

Phaedo show that 'Socrate mourant a les mêmes inquiétudes que Céphale' is wide of the mark. But in spite of these things, readers of the *Budé*

Republic should find it a useful, generally reliable, and stimulating book.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

THE TREASURERS OF ATHENA.

The Treasurers of Athena. By W. S. FERGUSON. Pp. xiii + 198; frontispiece. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$4 or 21s. 6d. net.

THIS book is written for specialists and attempts to clear up specific difficulties connected with the treasurers' records.

The accounts and inventories of the period of the Ionian War are first examined, and from such fragmentary material it is surprising that so much could be gleaned. The amalgamation of the two boards of treasurers is more securely dated to 406/5, and a strong case is put forward for making the secretaries of the united board continue a tribal cycle begun for the treasurers of Athena by the reformers of 411. Further progress is made in dating inventory fragments, and a crucial point here arises. While accepting Dinsmoor's dating of *I.G.* 1². 254 and 255 to 409/8 and 408/7, Ferguson holds that 255a (l. 323 sq.) was drawn up, not by the treasurers of Athena in 407/6, but by the united board of 405/4. The vote of the people sanctioning the consignment to the melting-pot of the Golden Nikai and the sacred treasures was not carried until Callias' year, and the treasures of the Pronaos, at any rate, were untouched until 405/4. Hellanicus and Philochorus mistakenly dated the golden coinage to Antigones' year because it was the treasurers of Antigones' year, still in office at the beginning of Callias' year, who handed over the treasures. It seems to me possible but unlikely that Hellanicus, a contemporary, made such a mistake; though Kirchhoff's restoration of 255a is almost certainly wrong, the text may be emended on the lines suggested by Ferguson without altering the accepted dating. In re-examining the accounts, Ferguson rejects the dating proposed for *I.G.* 1². 301 by

Bannier and Wade-Gery and sets it again conclusively in the period of the Ionian War: the definite assignment to 409/8 and the identification of the two main expeditions with those of Anytus to Pylos and Thrasyllus to Ionia are almost equally certain and of obvious importance to the chronology of the period. *I.G.* 1². 1686 is shown to be the accounts of 405/4, and the references to grain in the reverse are interpreted as state rationing during the siege.

After clearing up debated points in the history of the treasurers and their treasures in the fourth century, Ferguson devotes the last chapter to a more general review of Athenian war finance. While accepting in the main Kolbe's interpretation of the Callias decrees, he suggests that the provision for a secular reserve was actually put into effect after the Peace of Nicias. The debts of the Archidamian War were not repaid to the gods, but the surpluses of the imperial revenues were used to create an imperial fund which by 415 had reached the 3,000 talents set aside for the Sicilian expedition (*I.G.* 1². 99). This theory explains the apparent smallness of the sums borrowed from Athena in 416/5, and the borrowing of Cyzicene staters in 418/7 would be more natural if Athena's reserve was very low: but such a repudiation of the debt to the gods, even if only temporary, seems hardly in keeping with the atmosphere following the peace; and if the Athenians had an imperial reserve of 3,000 talents in 415 and decided to use it, why did they borrow from Athena at all until it was exhausted? Ferguson assumes that if the 3,000 talents were in the treasury of Athena a record of the sum must have appeared in *I.G.* 1². 302; but the amount could have been set aside without necessarily being spent in the year

of the decree. On such points general agreement will probably never be reached: Ferguson, however, always states his case fully and rarely overstrains the evidence. The results of the book may not be spectacular, but even those who despise the sorting of inventories will be grateful for a work

which gives an intelligible continuity to the financial ideas and practices of the Athenians.

Misprints are rare, but Kolbe, *Philologus*, 1930 (pp. 12, 131, 142, 143), should be *Philologus*, 1928.

R. MEIGGS.

Keble College, Oxford.

CATOPTROMANCY.

La catoptromancie grecque et ses dérivés.

Par A. DELATTE. Pp. 221; 12 plates. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. XLVIII.) Liège: Vailant-Carmann (Paris: Droz), 1932. Paper.

THIS learned and most interesting monograph begins with a survey, century by century, of medieval records of catoptromantic procedure in the various countries of Europe. Next comes a shorter survey of Moslem practice and theory.—M. Delatte may perhaps be interested in two references in the *Travels of Evliya Effendi*, the seventeenth-century Turkish traveller, to a Mirror Spring at Constantinople (I ii, p. 46, in von Hammer's translation) and to a Well of Souls north of Eyyub 'on the burying-ground' from which a voice is heard to answer the questioner (*ibid.*, p. 34) as well as in the account of divination by ink and oil on the palm of the hand in Browne's *A Year among the Persians*, pp. 146-7.—The classical passages referring to catoptromancy are then examined and are supplemented by some interesting Byzantine matter. Finally the archaeological evidence is discussed. The thesis of the monograph is that lecanomancy, in spite of an early blending of catoptromantic and lecanomantic methods, is to be clearly distinguished from catoptromancy: the first is a Babylonian and the second a Greek invention. The distinction, to take that first, is perfectly sound so long as we rigidly restrict the term lecanomancy to the drawing of omens from the splash or behaviour of objects or substances thrown into water, but quite early the bowl of water, like the well, was used as a mirror; that method we

must then classify as catoptromantic. I fully accept the strictures upon a definite mistake in my handling of Aristophanes *Acharnians* 1128: it is quite evident from Delatte's medieval parallels that the oil was applied to the surface of the shield, not to fill it with liquid. As to origin I am doubtful whether Babylonians were the sole inventors of lecanomantic divination. Its practice is widely distributed, and different materials, e.g. lead, wax, stearine, white of egg, are used as well as oil and pieces of metal. I am doubtful too about a single Hellenic origin for divination by the mirror. In its simplest form it may have originated wherever mirrors were used. An ordinary mirror will reflect what is in front of it: a magic mirror will reflect the distant ('Mirror, mirror on the wall, Who is the fairest girl of all?') or the future (e.g. the face of the husband to be). This simple form, the magical reflection, which is what you get in the *Acharnians* or the well at Patras, may surely have arisen independently in more than one place. I do not think, for example, that it would be easy to trace back either direct or through a Moslem source to classical antiquity the magic mirror of the Bavili of the Congo area (Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, p. 51). But quite early catoptromancy ceased to consist mainly of seeing magical reflections and became rather the real or supposed induction of visionary experiences by prolonged concentration of the vision upon a highly polished surface of some kind; hence the great variety of implements employed, though that most popular to-day, the crystal globe, is relatively late. Whether this grew out of consulting a magic

mirror or is really another independent idea I am not clear; Delatte regards it as primary. It is certain, however, that classical learned theory adopted this view of the nature of catoptromantic divination. It is abundantly shown too that European medieval theory and Moslem theory derive from the classical fount (see especially pp. 125-7, where Ibn Khaldoun and William of Auvergne are acutely and rightly convicted of a common though lost source).

I am not sure that discussion would not resolve my apparent disagreements with M. Delatte: I am quite sure that anyone who is interested in superstition, in the intricacies of magical elaboration, or in the continuity of the late classical and medieval cultures will find any amount of interesting matter in a monograph of impeccable learning and common sense.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

King's College, London.

EPIRUS.

Epirus. By GEOFFREY NEALE CROSS. Pp. ix + 137; one map. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 6s.

THIS book, the Prince Consort Prize essay for 1930, is the best history of Epirus so far written. It comprises chapters on early Epirus, its unification, Pyrrhus, and the later history; there are eight appendices, map, genealogical table, and index. Its principal merit lies in the handling of the Epirot constitution and the six inscriptions which bear upon it; it would have been useful had the text of these been printed. Mr. Cross attributes the inscriptions which mention both a king and a *prostates* to Alexander II and not, as has been customary, to Alexander I; those with a *prostates* alone he assigns tentatively to a period of kinglessness under Cassander's rule; the Epirot symmarchy belongs to Alexander I. I have never doubted, since I first knew of it, that Cross's brilliant arrangement is right; it replaces the former chaotic variations by a reasonable evolution, and he is justified of his claim that after the return of Alexander II from exile Epirus became a constitutional monarchy (rather perhaps quasi-constitutional); this again bears upon Doston's formation of a Macedonian *koinon*. (The *prostates* alone might be the executive of the lost kingship, just as Craterus was executive—*prostates*—of the kingship of the idiot Philip III.) He makes the Epirot symmarchy under Alexander I an imitation of Philip's League of Corinth, and practically makes Philip send Alexander to Italy. He perhaps sometimes overrates

Macedonian influence; e.g. p. 42 might have been different had he not missed the Cyrene inscription (Ferri no. 3) which shows that somewhere between 330 and 326 Olympias and Cleopatra were each ruling a section of Epirus; this has never been elucidated, and here was a chance. But, taken as a whole, the constitutional portions all through are very good; and incidentally the dual Epirot monarchy vanishes.

As regards Pyrrhus, he has some pertinent criticisms of Professor Tenney Frank in *C.A.H.* VII, but has been unable to resist finding some sort of method in Pyrrhus' actions; the Italian expedition, he thinks, was undertaken because Pyrrhus wanted to rule Sicily, and the Peloponnesian expedition was meant to turn Gonatas' flank; if so, it seems unfortunate that he should have attacked Gonatas' enemy Sparta and not his friends. Of the appendices, IV (on the inscriptions) is quite convincing, and VIII (the Acarnania problem) is sound and useful, but probably the question is insoluble without more evidence. On the other hand, in II, Alcetas son of Leptines (without βασιλέως) of Syll.³ 154 cannot possibly be, as Cross (following Dittmar) thinks, King Alcetas of Epirus (he has rightly seen in III that 'King Neoptolemus son of Alexander' of S.G.D. I. 1336 cannot be a son of Alexander I); and Beloch's view about Nereis and Deidameia, reproduced in VII, cannot survive analysis, for it sets up one of two contradictory statements in Pausanias, of all people, and a muddled statement at that, against (in effect)

Polybius and an inscription. But VI, the date of Acrotatus' death, is very good indeed; it has already supplied the one thing lacking to clinch the proof that (*pace* Professor Dinsmoor) the date of the Delphic archon Emenidas was 259, for M. Flacelière was

able to make use of Cross's argument (see *B.C.H.* LII p. 263 n. 5) when he finally settled this fixed point in the fluid Delphic chronology. One regrets, in reading this book, that the Bar has robbed scholarship of its author.

W. W. TARN.

MORE RAINER PAPYRI.

Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer). Neue Serie redigiert von HANS GERSTINGER; I. Folge. Griechischeliterarische Papyri I, bearbeitet von HANS GERSTINGER, HANS OELLACHER, KURT VOGEL. Pp. 170; 5 photographs. Vienna: Oesterr. Staatsdruckerei, 1932. Paper, S.19.48.

THIS new instalment of the Rainer Papyri contains much varied literary material. First come large remains of a treatise on mensuration; then two fragments of the *Iliad*, B and K; a bucolic fragment; a panegyric in hexameters on one Maximus, and on the *recto* some iambics; three small fragments of Aeolic lyric, one clearly containing a sapphic stanza; a fragment from a historian of the Diadochi; fragments of Demosthenes' *Midias*, *Aristocrates*, in *Stephanum II*, in *Polyclem*, *Isaeus* *Περὶ τοῦ Νικοστράτου κλήρου*; new fragments from the *Λόγοι κληρικοί* of Lysias, and some unidentified pieces.

Belonging to later ages are parts of an epideictic oration on an Emperor, probably Julian; of an encomium upon a citizen; of a philosophic treatise of aesthetic and doxographic content; a small fragment of mythology; of a school essay on the events which led up to the Trojan War; and of a grammatical treatise; a scrap of a metrical and grammatical nature, and another on metre; many fragments of an exegetical treatise on the later dithyramb, containing many new poetical extracts; some scholia on Pindar, *Pythian I*; a fragment probably of a commentary on a tragedian, with parts of some new iambic lines; and of a commentary on Demosthenes' *de Falsa Legatione*; long pieces of a textbook on astrology, and of a magical papyrus, and a few un-

identified pieces. The extracts close with what is apparently the 'book-plate' of one Σενούθιος, a common name in Egypt between the sixth and the eighth century; and the collection is enriched by five photographic facsimiles.

The extracts dealing with mensuration are regarded by the editors as coming from a school-book, and Professor A. L. Dixon, who has kindly examined them for me, confirms this, regarding them as being probably a school-book of exercises in the calculation of areas and volumes, with figures attached. He observes that the value of π is 3; that is to say, the perimeter of a circle is given as three times its diameter. That was the Babylonian measurement, and so we find it in the Bible, 2 Chron. iv. 2, in the dimensions of the 'molten sea' in Solomon's Temple: 'Also he made a molten sea of ten cubits from brim to brim round in compass . . . , and a line of thirty cubits did compass it round about.' But two hundred years before this papyrus was written (for the editors assign it possibly to the latter half of the first century B.C.) Archimedes had found the value between $3\frac{1}{7}$ and $3\frac{1}{2}$, so that these exercises must have been intended only for the rough and ready use of daily life. There are interesting signs for numbers and fractions, and the editors give a useful collection of terms employed in linear, plane and solid measurements.

Whether the panegyric in hexameters upon Maximus, a Tyrian general officer, and the iambics on the *verso* go together, cannot be determined; the only thing common to them is the mention of *Ἰταλοί*. Wilhelm closely examines the fragment of the history of the Diadochi, and guided by the

mention of Olympias, who is to be allowed ἀποικεῖν ἐν Ῥόδῳ, finds a reference to Philip Arrhidaeus. The fragment of Isaeus contains §§ 16-19 of his extant speech Περὶ τοῦ Νικοστράτου κλήρου, and is the second fragment of Isaeus which a papyrus has preserved. The Lysias contains four fragments of the lost speech Περὶ τῆς Ἀντιφώντος θυγατρὸς: two come from the peroration of a speech in support of an adoption by will; the others are not yet identified.

The fragment of a bucolic poem is pleasing. It contains portions of fifty-seven hexameters, many of them well preserved, describing how λάσιος Πάν took wax from a store of honey in an oak, melted it, and made pipes into which he blew. He is lying on the ground, wearied perhaps, as Oellacher suggests, by his efforts in piping, but his pipe is not with him. Silenus sees him, and addresses him in words of merry mockery. Oellacher prints the following text:

πῇ σοι πηκτὶς ἔβη, μηλοσκόπε, πῇ σὺ φλόμῳ γέ; 11
π[?] μελέων κλέος εὐρύ, τὸ καὶ Διδεὶ οἶσας' ἰάπτει;
ἢ ῥά σευ ὑπνώοντος ἀπειρεσίη . μετὰ θ[.]
κλέψε τῆν σύριγγα κατ' οἶρεα Δάφνις ὁ βοῶντης,
ἢ Ἀλδοστ' ἦτοι Θύρσις, Ἀμύντιχος ἢ Μενάλας. 15

In l. 12 Radermacher's ἰάπτει will hardly do, for the word is used of unpleasant blows; we should rather read ἰαίνει, cf. Pind. *Ol.* ii, 26: ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας . . . ἰανθεὶς αἰοίδαῖς. In 13 P. Maas supplies *θοίνην*, and this clearly demands ἀπειρεσίην: in 15 Ἀλδοσ is probably corrupt, and Ἀύκος unlikely: P. Maas, with much probability, suggests ἡ Λυκίδας ἢ Θύρσις. This extract may come from an Epyllion, or from a hymn

to Pan, and Oellacher thinks that the composition may not be much earlier than the time to which he assigns the papyrus, namely, the third or fourth century A.D.; and though in tone, style, and metre it is, as he points out, plainly indebted to Theocritus, it is perhaps preferable to ascribe it to the Roman age rather than to the Ptolemaic.

The remains of two rolls exhibit fragments of a treatise on the later Athenian dithyramb of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., in which are incorporated many new extracts from the dithyrambs themselves. Oellacher points out that the exegesis resembles the conclusion of Aristotle's *Politics* V, and that the extracts themselves exhibit all the marks of the new dithyramb, ἡρωικὴ ὑπόθεσις, λέξεις εἰρομένη, ἰδέα φλεγμαίνουσα, διπλὰ ὀνόματα, and obscurity. The first contains the opening of a dithyramb probably intended for the Great Dionysia. In line 5 Oellacher prints *πάρα δῶρα* *πάρα δ' ἄνθη*, but *πάρα δ' ὥρα*, which he suggests in his note, is far preferable. Another dithyrambic fragment contains a description of sleep.

There are also parts of seven iambic lines which are shown by the words *τριπλαῖς ὁδοῖς*, *φυτοσπόρον*, *μαίφονος*, to come from some tragedy on the subject of Oedipus, perhaps his purification.

The editors deserve our grateful thanks for the thoroughness and lucidity which characterize their work on this rich store of new material.

J. U. POWELL.

St. John's College, Oxford.

THE CYNIC STRAIN IN ROMAN SATIRIC THOUGHT.

Per la Storia della Satira. By NICOLA TERZAGHI. Pp. 168. Turin: 'L'Erma.' Paper, 15 lire.

THE author views satire predominantly on its ethical side as a *componimento a scopo e fondo morallegiante* (p. 76). True, he notes the existence of a primitive Roman *satira*; in fact, he countenances its early dramatic associations which it has been the fashion in some quarters to deny, but he puts that aside because it is the moral outlook that appeals to him. This limitation is not

expressed in the title, which the author himself feels is not quite satisfactorily defined. Potential consultants might have been glad to learn that the book mainly treats of Cynic influence on some Roman writers who are satiric without being professed satirists.

There are five chapters. The first is an excellent study of the characteristics of the Stoic and Cynic diatribe and of features in the street-preaching of Greek philosophers and in Menippos which reappear in Latin. One section

is devoted to a stimulating discussion on Roman originality à propos of Quintilian's famous *satura quidem tota nostra est*, which the author might perhaps think less 'unhappy' were he less concentrated on moral satire. This concentration leads to the sweeping generalisation that the fundamental motifs of Roman satire had all previously appeared in Greek literature (p. 52), and it minimises that variety and vivacity in the Roman medley which transcended Bionean and other Hellenic ingredients. Chapter II, on Phaedrus, is a judicious reminder of the fact, which Sejanus at least realised, that fables are adaptable to satiric purposes. III is on Petronius and Menippos; IV is on satire in Martial; V gives a concluding survey. An appendix on Persius *Satire II* and the *Second Alcibiades* is followed by an index. A bibliography would have been useful, although the notes afford full documentation. A few slips occur besides those in the list of *errata*—e.g.,

Armim, p. 16 n. 1; *potessa*, p. 64; *domadare*, p. 70. In the 'piccolo quadro' showing the evolution of satire on p. 45, *poi* might mislead in its suggestion that Lucilius came after Varro, while on p. 57 the argument should turn on the third and second centuries *before* Christ, not *after*, as in the Italian. *Scevo Memore* of p. 64 n. 5 has an equal right to be called *Sc(a)eva*; and at pp. 66-67 it seems doubtful whether Phaedrus had in view *liberti* so late as those of Claudius' days, but this must depend on the disputed dates of his different books.

It should be said that the ground covered by Signor Terzaghi is wider than his brief headings indicate. Thus, there is much instructive matter concerning the operation of diatribic influences upon formal satires such as those of Horace and Seneca.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

THE REIGN OF TIBERIUS.

The Reign of Tiberius. By F. B. MARSH. Pp. viii+336. Oxford: University Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 15s.

It is curious that although a flood of pamphlets and articles dealing with Tiberius and his treatment by Tacitus, coupled with the intensest kind of *Quellenforschung* and *Quellenkritik*, has poured forth steadily, few have attempted to embody the results of all this research in one comprehensive book. In English, at any rate, apart from the recent work of G. P. Baker (for Beesly's is antiquated and Tarver's not a serious contribution), there has been little by which the student could gain a *vue d'ensemble*. Now comes Professor Marsh's book, which within certain limits is as admirable as one could demand; the sanity and clearness of judgment that were so notable in *The Founding of the Roman Empire* are here as conspicuous. It is the wisest and most thorough book that has appeared upon Tiberius in English, and, as it is likely to be the standard textbook for some time, the best way to review it is

briefly to mention and appraise its contents in the modest hope that the author may consider some of these criticisms for his second edition.

In Chapter I, though some slight points may rouse disagreement, the account of Tacitus is excellent. M. shows how his prejudices and his attitude towards the Principate were formed by his own life and experiences, and by stressing his honesty, his care and his critical spirit defends him against those who see in him merely a historical charlatan.

Chapter II gives an admirable summary of the development and significance of the Principate and of the importance of the personality of Augustus, which is rightly emphasized. But the treatment of the early career of Tiberius is disappointing, for the bent of his mind was formed before he succeeded Augustus, and it is only by careful study of his early life that we can appreciate him properly. On p. 43, the date of his triumph is not 'early in the year' (A.D. 12) but October 23, as the Verulæ calendar shows.

Chapter III treats of the accession. Here M. draws a distinction between the aims of the old nobility and the new, which is very interesting and to me convincing, and his account of Germanicus and the Rhine mutiny is admirable. It is hard however to agree that Tiberius was not diffident (p. 47); diffidence is one of the features of his character and is seen in the *anxium iudicium* that Tacitus notes. On p. 51, I would suggest that the news of the Pannonian revolt *must* have reached Rome before September 17; if Drusus and his escort could be at the camp in Pannonia in time for the eclipse (which occurred on September 26), Tiberius must have known of the mutiny some days before the discussion in the Senate-house, and this would be one of the factors that caused him to hesitate.

In Chapter IV, 'Germanicus,' that amiable but bungling prince, receives his just due (though some mention might be made of his poetry), and the dilemma in which Tiberius stood towards him is clearly shown. I doubt when M. implies that the treasury was nearly empty (p. 76), for the evidence does not seem strong, and he wavers a little over the dismissal of Piso by Germanicus (cf. p. 91 n. 3 and pp. 94 and 97). Strangely enough not a word is said of the Germanicus-cities, of Nabat or Palmyra, of the *ala Antiana*, or of the two papyrus proclamations (edited by Wilamowitz and Zucker¹), and perhaps some notice might have been taken of von Domaszewski's intriguing theory² about P. Suillius Rufus as a spy. M. believes in the *secreta mandata* of Tiberius to Piso, though probability appears against them, but in the footnote to p. 97 he disposes properly of the rumour that associated Plancina with Martina the poisoner.

M. is admirably judicious in his treatment of the virtues and faults of the early government of Tiberius (Chapter V), on the growth and abuse of *maiestas*-trials, and so too in discussing the relations between Tiberius and the Senate: pp. 128-133 could scarcely be improved, and the whole chapter is one of the best

in the book. But were prosecutions for *maiestas* the only evil? Is there not evidence to suggest that the Lex Papia Poppaea was causing hardship, and was the new clause of Tiberius an alteration of mildness or of severity?

Chapter VI is called 'Tiberius and the Empire.' It contains an excellent account of Gaul and of the Rhine-Danube region (though, surprisingly, nothing is said of the *regnum Vannianum*), and of Thrace. Here we may ask whether Tiberius may not have thought of annexing the kingdom, and some attention might have been paid to Weber's article upon Malalas' report of the founding of a city called Tiberia in Thrace. It would be scarcely fair to expect any treatment of the problems of the Crucifixion, which is mentioned on pp. 147-8, but Pilate's awkward dealings with the Jews and the tact and sympathy of Vitellius call for notice, for all this is part of the government of the Empire. Tiberius' attitude towards long tenures, taxation and tribute is admirably narrated; admirable too the pages devoted to the provincial assemblies, though I suspect a slip in footnote 4 of p. 154, since an *ara* already existed in Tarraconensis.

Chapter VII, 'The Struggle for the Succession,' is the least convincing. Though M. explains well the first aims of Sejanus and his consistent undermining of Agrippina and her sons, and though he makes a good point about his connections with the commanders of the different army-groups, much of the rest (especially the 'conspiracy' of Sejanus) seems weak. It is not necessary to assume that the riot in *Annals* V, 4 was a pre-arranged affair any more than the popular demonstration for Octavia and against Poppaea in *Annals* XIV, 61. Is M. certain that Gaius was living on Capreae as early as he implies (p. 187), and may not Tiberius' summons of the boy have been his first step to counter Sejanus' plans? It might be suggested that the chronology of the year 31 can be determined with more precision than on p. 195, and Dio Cassius' version of Apicata's suicide should not be preferred to the more accurate information now available in the *Fasti Ostienses*.

¹ *Berlin Sitzb.* 1911, p. 794.

² *Rhein. Mus.* LXVII, 1912, p. 151.

The final chapter, 'The Close of the Reign,' illustrates well the virtues and weaknesses of the book. It opens with a determined attempt to minimize the Tiberian 'terror' as 'a product of imagination and rhetoric quite unsupported by the evidence,' and the way in which M. argues here savours a little of special pleading. The possibility that a number of the victims were not of high rank but 'probably slaves, freedmen, and clients of Sejanus' (p. 207) does not really improve the case. But the closing ten pages are extremely good and well-balanced: on the character of Tiberius, on the enormous difficulty of being a successor to Augustus, on the disastrous results of the seclusion of the *princeps* on Capreae upon the Senate, on the success of his rule in the provinces and of his administration M. is at his excellent best.

There follow seven appendixes where points connected with the sources or debateable questions are discussed at length, a four-and-a-half-page bibliography, two useful genealogical tables, and a comprehensive index. The bibliography is well selected, but I would suggest that in the second edition room should be found for Marchesi's *Tacito*, Motzo's articles upon the *Commentarii* of Agrippina, and articles (most of them published within the last two years) by Jean Gagé, R. S. Rogers, Kenneth Scott and Lily Ross Taylor.

Summing up, I feel that M. has lavished too much space upon analysis of the Tacitean Tiberius: justification is not hard, for in spite of all the aids to be derived from inscriptions, coins, and papyri, without Tacitus only a poor

feeble outline of the reign would be possible; comparison with that of Caligula, where Tacitus fails us, makes that abundantly clear. But I could wish that M. had devoted some of the pages of criticism of Tacitus to another appendix and discussed at greater length Tiberius' early life, education and tastes, or Germanicus' activities in the East, or other points—such as 'the sword of Tiberius,' the *Lex Visellia*, the *regnum Vannianum*—and that he had utilized more fully the evidence of coins and inscriptions; some use is made of *C.I.L.* and of Dessau, but Dittenberger or Cagnat-Lafaye are not mentioned and coins cited but rarely. The book is thus limited by M.'s pre-occupation with the literary tradition about Tiberius, and by possibly too severe a critical attitude towards it, but within these self-imposed limits it is extremely good. It digests and summarizes the results of the critical labours of some three generations of scholars, it contributes much that is new or freshly put, it is extremely level-headed (see e.g. the excellent treatment of Kessler's theory on pages 266-271): altogether it is a very reliable guide to the reign of Tiberius, and for the serious student it will be indispensable.¹

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

¹ The following misprints should be corrected: p. 9, *Ann.* 4. 11 should be 3. 11; p. 57, 'dissimulation' should be 'dissimulation'; p. 78, 'than' should be 'that'; p. 79, 'kingdom' should be 'kingdoms'; p. 120 n. 2, *Ann.* 1. 74 should be 1. 72; p. 145 n. 2, 3. 39 should be 3. 38; p. 149 n. 2, 3. 32 should be 3. 35; p. 153 n. 3, 4. 3 should be 4. 13; and on p. 217 n. 2, there should be a reference to *Ann.* 6. 47.

THE WORK OF CLAUDIUS.

L'Opera dell'Imperatore Claudio. By ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO. Pp. 142. Florence: Vallecchi, 1932. Paper, 10 lire.

THIS work is not a biography of Claudius; it consists of four essays which treat in turn of Claudius the scholar, his religious policy, his policy of centralisation, and the *Apocolocyntosis*. The author explains in his preface—and every serious historian will agree

with him—that, in view of the evidence of inscriptions and papyri, many of them of recent discovery, a revaluation of the policy and government of Claudius is called for. Dessau's history surprised its readers through failing to supply such a revaluation; but what was there desiderated is now most admirably supplied by Momigliano's excellent book.

Momigliano is at pains to emphasise

the contradiction which was involved in nearly every part of the policy of Claudius, a contradiction whose elements can be traced back to the settlement of Augustus himself. Claudius was an antiquarian; yet the chief lesson which he learnt from Rome's past was of the abiding necessity and value of reform. He treated the Senate and Equites with deference; yet he forced on them policies of which they did not approve and by his innovations he undermined their power more effectively even than his autocratic predecessor had done.

The book is interesting and most of its conclusions are unassailable; controversial questions are discussed at length, and a full bibliography of recent publications is given, in generous footnotes. The views of the author are not likely in every case to win universal assent. He believes that the Jews of Alexandria possessed *civitas Alexandrina* down to the time of Gaius; also he follows Willrich in thinking that the two embassies to which Claudius objected in his letter to the Alexandrines were two Jewish embassies. By an ingenious combination of Orosius 7. 6. 15 and Suet. *Claud.* 25 he dates the new Nazareth inscription to A.D. 49 and finds it typical of Claudius' religious

policy. Of small points, the statement about the fifth day of the Saturnalia (p. 56) is not quite accurate and the quotation from Tacitus *Annals* 4. 38 on p. 59 is curious. In view of the explicit statement of Cassius Dio, 59. 20. 5, it is scarcely legitimate to argue *ex silentio* (sic) that Claudius restored the elections to the Senate (p. 81). The suggestion on p. 94 that Claudius intended ultimately to abolish the post of *legatus legionis* is a long step from Suetonius' slender observation about military careers. In the discussion of the date of the creation of legions xv and xxii *Primig.* (p. 112) the centurion Italicus finds himself once more in the forefront of the argument; but surely the evidence of *C.I.L.* xiii. 11853-6, whose significance has been well explained by Ritterling, supplies far more reliable evidence of date.

There are occasional misprints, none of them very serious. A greater blemish is the absence of an index. The book is useful enough to deserve one; but perhaps the index has been excluded in order that the book might not be robbed of one of its great merits, its cheapness.

J. P. V. D. BALSDON.

Exeter College, Oxford.

A VINDICATION OF CALPURNIUS SICULUS.

La poesia di Calpurnio Siculo. By EMMANUELE CESAREO. Pp. iv + 220. (Reprinted from *Arch. Stor. Sic.*, N.S., LI-LII.) Palermo: published by the author (Via Catania 18), 1931. Paper, L. 50.

SIGNOR CESAREO unites penetrating aesthetic judgment with a catholic love of literature and an engaging style. His work in the pure literary criticism of writers who are not the greatest is opportune. He now attempts the first 'complete picture' of the art of Calpurnius Siculo (p. iii); and easily shows that Calpurnius is not a slavish copyist (imitatore pedissequo) of Vergil (pp. iv, 80, 90, 121 f., 183, etc.; cf. p. 40, note 1), but a poet of delicate sensibility and technical power (pp. iii f., 41 f., 154, 220, etc.), who excels, through his

sincere love of the country, in the direct presentation of country scenes [pp. 15 (on III. 5 f.), 18 f. (on III. 15 ff.), 50 (on II. 52 ff.), 82 f. (on VI. 32 ff.), 204, etc.]. Calpurnius has religious feeling, and blends religious, rustic, and erotic motives with success (pp. 44, 48, 50, 207 ff.). He has a 'psychological' understanding of love (p. 206; cf. 27, etc.); his dramatic situations and comic artifice deserve praise (pp. 37, 213, 218, etc.); and his verse can be both graceful and packed with meaning (p. 198). The critique is sometimes comparable to the 'symbolic' method at present applied in England to later poetry. 'Atmosphere' is well considered (p. 172 f.); Calpurnius can 'create an atmosphere with three words' [p. 190 (on IV. 108 f.); cf. 152]. The suggestive

force of references to distant places [p. 172 (on IV. 38 ff.); cf. 33, 217], and in general the effect of poetic symbols [pp. 140 (on I. 52 ff.), 184 (on IV. 95 f.), 211 (on I. 43 ff.), etc.; cf. 59 ff.], are noticed. The light-imagery at I. 77 ff. is compared with the imagery of Dante (p. 149). However, the judgments are not all favourable. Some eclogues have weak endings [pp. 34 ff., 38 ff. (on III.), 60 (on II.)], and the construction is sometimes imperfect (pp. 77, 89, 201 f., etc.). Calpurnius, in extending his literary form (p. 80), attempts tasks too hard for him (pp. 143, 185, 202); his choice of motive is sometimes narrow (pp. 58, 82), and he is occasionally rhetorical (p. 217). *Ec.* III. is the best; V. and VII. are also good (pp. 14, 155); VI. is the worst (p. 208).

The allegory is sanely and constructively treated (pp. 81, etc.). *Ec.* I., IV., VII. are allegorical; II., III., VI. may be; V. certainly is not (pp. 97, 101). The same name covers the same person always (p. 101). Corydon is Calpurnius (pp. 96 ff.; 158). Thyrsis [who may be the same as Iollas (p. 160): apparently a new suggestion] and Meliboeus [identifications of him are criticized (pp. 160 ff.)] are patrons (pp. 100, 128, 153). Tityrus of course is Vergil at IV. 62 ff. (p. 98: Tityrus at III. 97 f. is not explained). The locality at VII. 30 ff. can perhaps be identified (pp. 104 ff.). Modern Sicilian usage is interestingly cited to show that *frater Amyntas* (IV. 79 ff.) need not be a true brother (p. 159). The life-history and personal qualities of the poet are boldly inferred (pp. 162 ff., 168 f.); it is even suggested that Corydon significantly speaks better poetry than Amyntas [p. 187 (on IV. 97 ff.)]. The respect of Calpurnius for Nero is natural [p. 157 note 1 (cf. p. 192, etc.); but Cesareo supposes a strain of mockery at VII. 79 ff. (pp. 117 f.)]; the worship of emperors was compatible with native Roman ideas (p. 182). *Ec.* I. and IV. are later than the 'pure pastorals' (p. 164); IV. is later than VII. (p. 160); and II. than VI. (p. 92).

Some adverse criticisms of the book are due. *maturā* (II. 33) seems (p. 46) to be taken with *arbore*. *doctus* (IV. 59) means 'inspired' (cf. *Hor. Sat.* I. 15, etc.) rather than 'erudite' (p. 174).

silere in silentibus armis (I. 67) seems (p. 146 note 1) confused with *tacere* (cf. anyhow *Cic. pro Mil.* IV. 10). There is no contradiction (p. 130) at I. 10, since *rapidus* in *rapidus sol* does not mean 'swift.' On at [p. 182 (on IV. 84)] a reference to H. F. Rebert in *Class. Phil.* XXIV. (1929), pp. 169 ff., is desirable (cf. Rebert, p. 175: 'at, originally an interjection, never loses a certain exclamatory force'). Motives, 'epic,' 'bucolic,' etc., are too rigidly distinguished (Cesareo, pp. 111, 179, etc.). Calpurnius is blamed not very fairly for failure when he admits epic influence (p. 155, etc.); the thin vowel sounds at I. 55 ff. seem to show that he remembered not to overweight his verse. Concrete expression is characteristic rather of most good poetry than of popular poetry (as maintained on p. 78). The question of classical imitation seems out of focus. The results of A.-M. Guillemin [*L'originalité de Virgile* (Paris, 1930), etc.; cf. R. B. Steele in *Class. Phil.* XXV. (1930), pp. 328 ff.] and others are neglected; so that the defence of Calpurnius is sometimes out of date, and he is exonerated from a quite hypothetical 'imitation.' He is said to be afraid to depart from his models (p. 28; but cf. 39); and, elsewhere, to be too anxious to be original (p. 90; cf. 183). He is censured for inconsistency incurred in following a source (p. 196): but this is typical of Vergil himself, whose poetry suffers little or no loss by the contradictions. Reminiscences of course strengthen the poetry of Calpurnius (cf. especially pp. 195 f.). Parallels are occasionally missed [*Ciris* 402 f. (p. 144); Verg. *Aen.* I. 282 (p. 167); *Hor. Carm.* I. ii. 41 (p. 194)]; and, when they are, the conclusions reached by a method which involves an almost continuous quest of sources may be affected.

The book has a pleasant format and margins; it deserves better paper and fewer misprints (of about fifty hardly any are serious, but some might confuse foreign readers). A comma is used which sometimes looks like a full stop. There is a good bibliography (p. 8 note 2 cont. pp. 9 f.), but no index.

Signor Cesareo has written an attractive and valuable book. Characteris-

tically, he faces and works out the implications of his views (*cf. esp. p. 219*), and never shirks a risk. If he had done otherwise, some of his judgments might have been more widely accepted; but

he would not have deserved so much gratitude from the world of letters.

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

SENECA AS A TRAGIC POET.

Le tragedie di Seneca. By EMMANUELE CESAREO. Pp. iv + 114. Palermo: published by the author (Via Catania 18), 1932. Paper, L. 60.

SIGNOR CESAREO'S latest work seems even better than his volume on Calpurnius; the minor decisions are more generally convincing. He now proves the high merit of Seneca's tragedies, especially (p. 44) of the *Thyestes* (pp. 70 ff.), *Phaedra* (pp. 83 ff.), and *Medea* (pp. 94 ff.). He argues successfully that the *Hercules Octaeus* is spurious (pp. 30 ff.; but *cf. p. 31* with p. 60), but accepts the *Agamemnon* (p. 60); he does not treat the *Octavia* or the *Phoenissae*. He shows well how little Seneca is dependent on Euripides (pp. 3 ff., 45 ff., 94; *cf. 30*), and on Aeschylus (pp. 61 ff., 64, 68), and that he belongs rather to a Latin tradition than to the Greek (pp. 34, 47, 66, 71). But there is a tendency to neglect the influence of lost poetry, though it is mentioned as possible (pp. 29, 45, 58 f., 71, 95, 98). Evidence of this influence is strong in the *Troades*, where Seneca seems to have access to an early mythographic tradition otherwise hardly known. Here the almost comic pathos of Hecuba, thought strange by Cesareo (p. 50), requires a reference to her character in former Latin drama: the same sources have left traces both in Sen. *Troad.* 32 ff. and Verg. *Aen.* II. 515 ff. Cesareo sometimes [pp. 10, 14 f., 21 (the *necyia* in *Herc. Fur.*); 55 f. (Hector, etc., in *Troad.*); *cf. 71*] attributes to a direct dependence on Vergil similarities which are better explained by common sources, since the divergences are characteristic of Vergil's method, and are intrinsically unlikely to be due to Seneca. Sometimes an extant parallel is missed [pp. 50 (on *Troad.* 41; *cf. Verg. Aen.* II. 746), 54 (on *Troad.* 353 ff.; *cf. Verg. Aen.* II. 694, 728, etc.), 67 (on *Agam.* 729; *cf. Verg. Aen.* VI. 641,

etc.), 75 (on *Thyest.* 250; *cf. Verg. Aen.* IV. 272, etc.), 98 (on *Med.* 20 f.; *cf. Aesch. Choeph.* 289 ff.), 104 (on *Med.* 732; *cf. Verg. Aen.* III. 241, etc.)]; or a similarity very weakly attested (*e.g.* pp. 10, 32; *cf. 72 f.*). Once (p. 13) a reminiscence of Vergil is actually excused on the ground that Vergil had already become a classic: surely a fanciful and needless excuse. Cesareo, perhaps owing something to Herrmann [whom he quotes (p. 76) for the successful fusion of characters and theme in the *Thyestes*], is keenly sensible to purely poetic, especially symbolic, effects (pp. 10 f., 16, 22 f., 57, 65 f., 70 ff., 73, 80, 87, 89, 98, 103, 106, 110, 114). He decides that the 'atmosphere' at *Oed.* 998 ff. (p. 114) would have been more appropriate in another play; and elsewhere (pp. 23, 35, 66, 80, 89) nearly sees that the plays can be distinguished accurately by their individual atmosphere and imagery (obvious examples are the tempests in *Thyest.*, nature-symbolism in *Phaedr.*, and foreign, strange, and barbaric suggestions in *Med.*), concurrently with their 'psychopathic' determinations [often profoundly observed; *e.g.* pp. 72 ('Seneca patiently tracks down the last faint vestiges of humanity' in *Thyestes*), 102 ('At the base of Medea's words lies a melancholy longing for peace'; *cf.*, however, pp. 82, 83 f.)]. The excellent comparison of Shakespeare (p. 112) might have been extended to explain generally many poetic facts in Seneca (who, of course, helped to make him). Possibly, if the method of the book had been more clearly defined and its results further co-ordinated, their originality and importance would have been more fairly shown, and some judgments also might have been affected [*e.g.* pp. 9, 30 (theophany should not now be too readily called extrinsic); 27, 76, 90 (an anachronism in poetry is more often a

poetic necessity than a fault to be extenuated); 26, 28, 36, 59, 94, 99 ff. (passages which seem overloaded with mythology or too lightly attached may be poetically organic; but cf. pp. 3 f., 9, etc., where Cesareo is lenient to apparent faults)]. However, it is now made fully clear that Seneca, though he sometimes dramatizes a philosophical conception (pp. 70, 99, 102), on the whole writes pure poetic tragedy, not as a philosopher, but as a poet. The printing of the book is quite good; but commas and brackets are irregularly

associated, and I have found about ten other small misprints. On p. 68 *Aen.* VI. 364 ff. should be *Aen.* VI. 499 ff.

Signor Cesareo could render a useful service by writing a book on the general principles of criticism applicable to classical poets. But it would be ungrateful to complain because something still remains to be given. His book on Seneca is full of penetrating aesthetic analysis, and it ought to please and enlighten all who have enjoyed the plays themselves. W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

THE ART OF LUCAN.

Lucan-interpretationen. Von MARIE WUENSCH. Pp. 62. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Paper, M. 3. THIS work examines certain portions of Books VII. and IX. of Lucan in order to gain a conception of the poet's *Arbeitsweise*. His treatment of his sources is considered, the selected parts of the poem are carefully analysed, and explanatory or controversial comments are made on various lines and passages. In Book VII. the narrative of the battle of Pharsalia and the description of the preceding prodigies are especially dealt with; in Book IX. Cato's march is naturally the chief subject of discussion. The writer regards Livy as almost, if not quite, the only source of Lucan's narrative, and she uses Appian, Plutarch, Dio, and Florus with great confidence to indicate what Livy wrote. This procedure certainly has the merit of simplicity, but there are some awkward objections to it. These need not be pointed out here; it may, however, be mentioned that the writer has a somewhat limited acquaintance with modern *Quellenforschung* as applied to Lucan; her list of authorities does not include Vitelli or Ussani or Pichon, and she seems to know nothing of Cichorius's paper on Cornutus (*Röm. Stud.*, pp. 261 ff.).

Some readers will find the analyses rather tedious, but one who has just read the Latin for the first time will find

them very useful in gathering up his impressions, and there is no one who will not discover at least a few helpful suggestions in the interspersed comments on Lucan's motives and procedure. Some difficult questions of text or interpretation are tackled with varying success. There is a good deal of force in the writer's arguments against considering VII. 168-172 as a parenthesis and referring vv. 173-184 to the Pompeians. Her defence of v. 154 in the same book is less successful, and in her treatment of the well-known transpositions in the narrative of the battle she goes rather far astray by minimising the significance of *et* in v. 514, by imagining that vv. 510-513 are merely a reproduction in other words of vv. 514-520, and by failing to see that the latter passage is an intelligible sequel to vv. 487 sq.

In short, the book shows signs of immaturity, and its reasoning is not always sound; it also contains a good deal of superfluous matter; nevertheless it is an honest, diligent, and helpful piece of work in which every student of Lucan will find something worth reading. But the Pompeian leader in Africa was not Varius (p. 45), and the Cambridge Professor of Latin did not write *opportuit* (p. 53).

W. B. ANDERSON.

University of Manchester.

PLINY ON CHEMISTRY.

The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects. Part II. Edited with Translation and Notes by KENNETH C. BAILEY. Pp. 287. London: Arnold, 1932. Cloth, 15s.

By the completion of the second volume of the Elder Pliny's chemical works, Mr. Bailey has certainly accomplished the task which he set himself to fulfil, namely that of providing for students of the classics an up-to-date edition of part of the works of a great Roman and of furnishing those who are interested in the history of chemistry with information vital to their subject.

Pliny's *Natural History* in thirty-seven books is a most voluminous work, being as it is a sort of encyclopaedia of science, which can only be adequately digested in parts; and this we are enabled to do by the careful selection of chemical chapters.

In the present volume, which might almost be entitled 'Chapters on Mineralogy,' Pliny touches on the properties of copper, iron, lead, tin, arsenic, brass and bronze, also of pigments, stones and glass. There is much miscellaneous information such as that in a treaty

which Porsena granted to the Roman people after the expulsion of the kings we find a specific clause forbidding the use of iron, except for agriculture, in order to prevent its use as an instrument of war and murder; also that the collapse of buildings in Rome was due to the pilfering of lime, so that 'stone is laid on stone without proper mortar.' Though Buffon said of Pliny that he had 'cette facilité de penser en grand qui multiplie la science,' it is difficult to regard him, from an intellectual standpoint, as much more than a colligator of facts. He is strikingly devoid of originality, and never attempts to generalise or draw inferences from the facts he has so laboriously collected. By his great power of compressing a large amount of information into an extremely small space, translation is made decidedly difficult, a difficulty, however, which Mr. Bailey has most successfully surmounted by the help of copious, erudite and illuminating notes.

The index, which in an intricate work of this kind presents many obstacles, has clearly been very carefully compiled.

R. O. MOON.

ROMAN TACTICS.

Die römische Taktik zu Beginn der Kaiserzeit und die Geschichtsschreibung. Von F. LAMMERT. Pp. 64. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXIII, Heft II.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1931. Bound, M. 4.50.

THE main purpose of this essay is to trace the development of Roman tactics in the early Principate. The victories of Rome over Macedon had been won by the superiority of her infantry drawn up in open order and armed with *pilum* and *gladius* over the close-order formation of the phalanx. But when the legions came into contact with an enemy whose strength lay either in cavalry or in archers or other light-armed troops, they were severely handicapped by the heaviness of their armour and their consequent inability to adapt themselves to a new and more mobile type of warfare. In the first

chapter the author shows how these disadvantages were in part at least overcome by the development of artillery inside the legion and by the organization of auxiliary cavalry, which fought sometimes in conjunction with light-armed troops, sometimes, as in Caesar's Gallic campaigns, supported by the heavy-armed infantry. Such tactical changes, the author maintains, necessitated changes in armour, and in Chapter Two he traces the substitution of the *lancea* fitted with an *amentum* for the *pilum* and of the *spatha* for the *gladius*. This development is definitely attested by Arrian in his ἑκταῆς κατ' Ἀλάνων, but the author holds that it had already taken place by the middle of the first century A.D. The apparent contradiction to this hypothesis in Tacitus and Vegetius he disposes of by the theory that the old terms such as

pilum and *gladius* still survived in writers who were not military specialists to denote the new weapons that were modifications of those formerly in use.

Of particular interest is Dr. Lamert's contention that *Germania*, Chapter Six, is derived from Pliny's *De Iaculatione Equestri* and his detailed examination of Crassus' order of march and of battle at Carrhae. Even if exception may be taken to the theory that a change in tactics produces a change of armour and not *vice versa*,

and even if the treatment of the language of Tacitus may not meet with general acceptance, the treatise is the most important contribution that has in recent years been made to our knowledge of how the Roman army adapted its dispositions to meet the different tactics of its opponents. The work is a worthy complement to Couissin's *Les Armes Romaines*.

H. M. D. PARKER.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

THE SCRIPT OF COLOGNE.

The Script of Cologne from Hildebald to Hermann. By L. W. JONES. Pp. xii + 98 + 100 plates. Cambridge (Mass.): The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1932. Heavy green buckram, \$20 post free.

IF palaeographers had been called upon to give a list of the writing-schools of Western Europe in the period of Charlemagne that deserved special study, Cologne would certainly have found a place in the list. The well-guarded treasures in the north tower of the cathedral have been for years calling aloud for a monograph, and Assistant Professor Jones of the College of the City of New York, pupil of Professor Rand and already a recognised authority on the MSS. of Terence, has now done the work in an entirely satisfactory manner. The period covered by him is that from Hildebald (A.D. 785-819) to Hermann (890-923). It is uncertain whether the MSS. belonging to an earlier period which are now at Cologne were really written there, though a city of this importance, reaching back to the middle of the first century, must have had a writing-school from an early date. The MSS. later than Hermann are left for subsequent study. What is most needed at the present time is certainly an intensive study of all scripts in existence from A.D. 600 to 850.

Dr. Jones has wisely been most rigorous in testing the claims of MSS. to a Cologne origin, and in fact only twenty-eight have passed his test. He starts with the list of A.D. 833 and those

MSS. in it bearing a statement that they were written under Hildebald, and includes others only after the most careful scrutiny. His descriptions follow the plan of his master in dealing with Tours. The leaves are measured, the method of ruling is indicated, the nature of the gatherings is specified along with the signatures, and abbreviations and punctuation are fully discussed.¹ It is not surprising that practically all the MSS. discussed show traces of insular influence. The full extent of this influence, palaeographically and textually, will one day be set forth, and will show how deeply all students of Latin literature are indebted to insular scribes. In Cologne, however, one is struck by the absence of the characteristic insular abbreviations for *autem* and *enim* from many of the MSS. The minute palaeographical descriptions of the MSS. are a model which might well be followed by others, and the feature of pages 74-76, the list of 109 special symbols represented in their proper shapes, will be simply invaluable to the student of Latin scripts. One is impressed by the

¹ A special study of MSS. of all schools where Q is used along with a number in signing quaternions is required: the use is certainly as old as the sixth century, and perhaps characteristic of that century. I have seen it later in St. Omer 33 bis (saec. ix in. St. Bertin); Paris 9530 (saec. viii-ix, Echternach), 9535 (saec. viii-ix, Echternach); Angers 148 (140) (saec. ix in.). Perhaps the presence of this Q is a proof that a MS. was copied direct from a sixth-century original, but it is premature to argue.

large number of scribes taking part in the production of individual MSS., a practice also followed at Murbach. To save space the reader is often referred to H. Foerster, *Die Abkürzungen in den Kölner Handschriften der Karolingerzeit* (Tübingen, 1916), for complete lists of abbreviations. This procedure is somewhat unfortunate. Foerster's book appeared during the Great War before America came in, and I for one have never seen it or heard of it before. A table of the MSS. in which each abbreviation occurs would not have added greatly to the size of the present volume. I have found the 'capricious' abbreviation seqt (p. 52) also in Karlsruhe Aug. cxciv (written about 820 at Reichenau). The classical student will be especially interested in Jones No. 23, British Museum Harleianus 2767, the oldest MS. of Vitruvius, and

a very attractive MS. too, as all who have handled it will testify. The Letter to Valentinus 'de correptione et gratia,' which Jones (p. 69) believes to be unpublished, is the treatise of that name published in the tenth volume of Augustine's works; also the Letter of St. Evodius to Valentinus, which he believes unpublished, was published by Dom Morin in the *Revue Bénédictine*, vols. xiii and xviii, and in part already by Sirmond about 300 years ago. On p. 85 'Uzalensis' is the correct form, and for 'Adrimentinum' read 'Adrimetinum' (*i.e.*, Hadrumentinum) with the MS. The indexes deserve high commendation; the photographic facsimiles are above praise. This work is altogether a notable contribution to the study of Latin palaeography.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Griechisches und römisches Privatleben. Von E. PERNICE. Pp. 87. *Der griechische und der hellenistische Staat.* Von V. EHRENBURG. Pp. 104. (Gercke und Norden, *Einführung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, II. 1; III. 3). Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Stiff paper, RM. 3.24 and 5.

SECTION II. 1 covers the topics of the House, Costume, Birth, Marriage and Death, with a considerable appendix upon Homeric weapons. The treatment is learned, informative, and sensible, with adequate references to the German literature upon these topics. In some respects and in essential rightness it is an improvement upon the corresponding section of Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* (particular praise perhaps may be given to the section on the house), but it suffers from two serious defects. Firstly, the scale is too small for a real work of reference and the enquirer upon points of detail is likely to be disappointed. Though the section on Homeric weapons is interesting, it is both controversial and out of scale. In a work of reference the space might have been better used in a fuller treatment of other topics. Secondly, and this is clearly the author's own opinion, a work upon the private life of Greeks and Romans without illustrations is an impossible task to carry out as one would wish. These criticisms apply less to the author's ability or competence than to the conditions imposed upon him. Within them he has on the whole selected judiciously, except perhaps for a pardonable excursus on a quite lively hobby-horse (Homer and Dipylon pottery): he writes with real knowledge and his comment is often illuminating. There are naturally points about which differences of opinion are possible. Some of us, for example, do not agree with Samter and Diels in seeing *Sühnopfer* every-

where. There are also inevitably some small holes which might be picked. For instance, why employ such antiquated references as *Ath. Mit.* I, 139 ff. and *I.G.* 3562 for the funerary laws of Iulis and Gambreion, both of which are in Dittenberger, and if reference is made to them, why not also to the *lex Labyadarum*? The omission of *I.G.* IV, 1607 and *I.G.* V, 2. 4 is intelligible enough, for there is little to be learned from these fragments, but the Delphic inscription is important. Other similar criticisms of minutiae could be made, but in spite of them, and of the more serious defects imposed by the conditions laid down, readers of the volume will find much to learn in it and will envy the author's evident knowledge of the subject.

In Section III. 3, after a preliminary survey of geographical and social factors and their consequences, the city-state is described under such headings as 'citizenship,' 'forms of constitution,' 'popular assembly,' 'council,' 'officials,' 'courts of law,' 'cult,' 'law,' 'military organisation,' 'economics and finance.' This is followed by a most excellent analysis, 'vom Wesen der Polis.' A section is then devoted to Staatenbund und Bundestaat from the early Amphictyonies to the Aetolian League. The second half of the book deals similarly with the Hellenistic State: the nature of Hellenistic monarchy, officials, relations between the states and cities, religion, law, military organisation, economics and finance. To both sections are appended brief but excellent references to the relevant literature.

If the book is not very easy reading it is a masterpiece of compression. The fruits of a wide and accurate scholarship are condensed into amazingly small compass, and that without loss of a sense of proportion or sacrifice of the

relative importance of main themes to detail. The balance, too, between political theory and historical practice is well preserved. It is, in fact, an excellent piece of thoughtful craftsmanship, and will repay the rather close and laborious attention which its perusal demands. There is little to choose between the two halves of the book in merit, but the lack of treatises on the constitutional theory and history of the Hellenistic type of state lends a particular value to the second.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

King's College, London.

Vrijheid en Gelijkheid in Athen. By DR. D. LOENEN. Pp. 324. Amsterdam: Seyffardt, 1930. Paper, 4.90 florins.

WHETHER 'Fredome is a noble thing' or not depends upon how it is acquired and employed; and the history of freedom is often 'sordid, bloody, and dull.' Dr. Loenen's dispassionate study of the fluctuating meanings and implications of 'freedom' and 'equality' in Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries is a disenchanting review of occasional courage and sacrifice, and recurrent lies and self-deception and brutality. There is much that is interesting in it and much that is salutary; but I confess for my own part I found it too long and repetitive, and too little selective to leave any real clearness: to read it was like playing with a kaleidoscope. Moreover, there are too many errors, major and minor, for a book which must depend upon accuracy of detail. For example, *ὄνομα πάντων κάλλιστον* (Hdt. III 80) and *ὄνομα εὐπρεπές* (Thuc. III 82) have, in their contexts, nothing to do with each other (p. 48, n.); Thera on p. 80 is a mistake; the charge against the generals at Arginusae is misunderstood on p. 116—it was not 'drifting corpses' which they failed to rescue; Hemelrijk's *Περί τοῦ Πλοῦτος* is cited (p. 144), but the author ignores the central doctrine of the book; and the same might be said of his frequent citation of Hasebroek. The documentation is full, though sometimes capricious: e.g. no reference is given for Antiphon (p. 81) or Diopieithes (p. 115). Misprints are very numerous, but easily corrigible for the most part: on p. 28 Hdt. VI 23 should be VI 123; Hdt. I 66 on p. 112 is wrong; the date on p. 32 should be 454. The haplography 'Pickard, C.A.H. VI' (p. 246) may interest the Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield.

D. C. MACGREGOR.

Balliol College, Oxford.

Das Menologium des Liber Glossarum. Von KRISTER HANELL. (*Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund*, 1931-32, II.) Pp. 32. Lund: Gleerup, 1932. Paper, kr. 1.25.

THE author discusses the source of the month-name items of the *Liber Glossarum* which were published in full and discussed in *J.H.S.* XLIII (1923), 102-116. He attributes the major errors to the mechanical equating of the *caput anni* of several series of non-Roman months with *Ianuarius*. Special attention is paid to the details of the Etruscan, Perinthian,

and Byzantine items for which the *Lib. Gloss.* is our sole authority; there is also an excursus on the Cappadocian Calendar. The work is based on a wide knowledge of the subject, is clearly written and full of interesting lore. It will be of importance to all who deal with comparative chronology.

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

Aberystwyth.

Fonti per la Storia della Religione cyrenaica. Raccolte e commentate da LUISA VITALI. (R. Università di Padova, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Vol. I.) Pp. xix+165. Padua: 'Cedam' (Casa editrice dott. Antonio Milani), 1932/X. Paper, l. 20.

THIS is a piece of useful and well-informed research, conveniently arranged. The authoress has collected all available evidence—literary, epigraphic and monumental—bearing on the religion of Kyrene; 'religion' being generously interpreted to include mythology, and several extracts being printed which prove no more than that certain divine names were not unknown to Kyrenaia [e.g. No. 262, a commonplace about the whims of Fortune from a sepulchral inscription, which certainly proves nothing for cult; and No. 5, a few lines from the *Rudens* about the *fanum Veneris*, which as Signorina Vitali admits (p. 124) need never have existed outside the comedian's imagination]. But it is better in such cases to admit too much than too little. Some of the material is from recent discoveries of the Italian archaeologists in Kyrene, not always readily obtainable from other sources. There is an Italian translation of them, not always quite impeccable, and in the last part of the monograph a learned, sensible and clear commentary on the material, which does not try to prove more than our present knowledge warrants and for the most part interprets the evidence justly and with good insight. The University of Padua has made a good start with its new series, and it is to be hoped that so well-equipped a writer will give us more.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

M. TULLIUS CICERO, Fasc. 48: *De Officiis*, edidit C. ATZERT; *De Virtutibus*, edidit O. PLASBERG. Pp. xxxiii+186. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Cloth, Rm. 4.32; unbound, 3.60.

THIS new edition is, except for a supplementary preface and minor additions to the critical apparatus, a reprint of the 1923 edition. In the supplementary preface the editor acknowledges his debt to the two works of Goldbacher on the *De Officiis*, and states that he had arrived at similar results independently. References to Goldbacher are added in the critical apparatus where possible, and the rest are given on pp. xxxii-xxxiii. The *corrigenda* of the 1923 edition have been inserted. The additions to the critical apparatus consist of new references and small corrections of detail. They

occur on pp. 4, 16, 24, 33, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 45, 58, 61, 73, 76, 77, 122, 125, 137, 154, 158.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

Cicero. By TENNEY FRANK. Annual Lecture on a Master Mind: Henriette Hertz Trust of the British Academy. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVIII.) Pp. 26. London: Milford, 1932. Paper, 1s. 6d.

THERE is wide agreement now that it is an unintelligent reading of history which claims to sum up Cicero as a double-minded man unstable in his ways, though some have been dazzled by Caesar-worship into a bat-blindness in regard to his merits. Ample justification can be found for an appreciation of him as many-minded in the broadest sense and as an apostle of humanity, cultural and moral. Professor Frank's task, admirably performed in this lecture, was to suggest that Cicero may be considered a master mind, or, if any dare cavil at the phrase, then demonstrably a pervading force in the world. This is illustrated in a succinct survey of the most eminent achievements of Cicero the thinker, speaker, writer, politician and patriot. The end in apparent failure must never blur the actual truth that certain of his political and legal conceptions had such inherent greatness and, despite the clouds which descended upon his name, such permanent vitality as to make a real contribution to the progress of civilization. 'He had faith in ideals, the worth of which will always be recognized by men of sanity, since they lie at the very root of human nature.' 'Dichaearchus' on p. 10 ought to have been corrected.

Armstrong College, J. WIGHT DUFF.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

P. Ovidius Naso. Vol. III, fasc. 2. *Fastorum libri VI*. Post R. EHWARDIUM iteratis curis edidit F. W. LENZ. Pp. xxxii + 266. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Cloth, R.M. 6.40 (unbound, 5.60).

THIS is a second edition of the text of the *Fasti* published in 1923, and embodies the results of the editor's fresh collations of the Codex Regi-nensis (A), the Ursinianus, and the Monacensis, as well as readings from two MSS., the Zulichemianus and the Mazarinianus, which were long believed lost and have recently been discovered and collated by Alton. The *apparatus criticus* has been completely remodelled, and there are a good many alterations of detail. The general principles of the recension are not entirely clear. Dr. Lenz in his introduction warns us not to dogmatise about the relationship of the MSS., and he is likewise guarded in expressing an opinion about their respective authority. Most editors since Merkel have regarded A as of primary importance; Dr. Lenz speaks rather disparagingly of this MS., and says he is far from accepting it as 'unicum testem.' Nevertheless, the present text is usually closer to A than that e.g. of Davies in the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, and there seem to be few cases in which Dr. Lenz has

rejected a consensus of A and U. Thus, for instance, in III 64 he retains A's and U's 'et redigunt actos in sua iura boves,' though 'rura' has MS. authority and it is hardly possible to extract any meaning from 'iura.' In general the text is a cautious and conservative one. Where Dr. Lenz does admit conjecture he is not always happily inspired; in III 451 the 'caesae grvida cervice Medusae' of the MSS. is surely preferable to Madvig's 'caesa gravidae.' The great merit of the edition is its excellent *apparatus criticus*, and Dr. Lenz has done a real service to students of the *Fasti* by his careful collation of the three principal MSS. K. R. POTTER.

University of Edinburgh.

Seneca: Moral Essays. With an English translation by JOHN W. BASORE (Loeb Classical Library.) In three volumes. Vol. II. Pp. xi + 496. London: Heinemann, 1932. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net. Mr. BASORE's second volume, published four years after the first, about which something was said in C.R. XLIII, 1929, pp. 229-230, contains VI to XII of the *dialogi*. The text could be improved at some places; much of the translation is good, but some of it is heavy and clumsy, and there appear at times archaic or unusual expressions such as 'to trail upon wealth,' 'to bolster a thing' and 'to count that,' and there are misunderstandings of the Latin. VI. 6. 2 *dolor qui perit* not 'perishable' but 'futile.' 10. 6 *incerta maria* not 'unknown' but 'fickle.' 13. 2 *dignus memorabili dedicatione* not 'worthy to be consecrated in memory' but 'to perform this notable dedication.' 18. 2 *remissum* better 'dim' than 'reflected.' 18. 7 *magna* is feminine as in *Aen.* II. 6. 26. 7 *iterum ista moliri* not 'work once more this ruin' but 'create the universe anew.' VIII. 5. 1 *quod prius diximus* not 'what I have said before' but 'the former point.' IX. 2. 1 *reliquias effugerunt* not 'escaped the grave' but 'the last traces of illness.' 5. 1 *malorum* is better neuter. 11. 1 *mancipia* not 'chattels' but 'slaves.' 14. 1 *destinatis rebus* not 'fortune allotted to us' but 'what we have resolved upon'—cp. *consili*. There are other faults at VI. 1. 2, 8. 1, 9. 5, 13. 1, 18. 3, VII. 11. 4, 24. 3, VIII. 3. 2, IX. 2. 12, 10. 7, 11. 12, 14. 8, XI. 5. 2, 11. 5; and words are untranslated at VI. 3. 1, 24. 1, IX. 2. 6, 2. 10, 11. 4, XI. 1. 3, 9. 8, 21. 1, XII. 13. 3.

On p. 440 and elsewhere there is confusing inconsistency in the form of the critical notes, which are not chosen on any discoverable principle and are not quite accurate on pp. 32, 92, 244, 274, 278 (*teste* Gertz) and 298. Conjectures are not always assigned to their originators. It should be at VI. 10. 3 not Waltz, who himself says '*unus dett.*'; 20. 3 not Waltz in edition of 1923 but L. Castiglioni *Ath.*, IX, 1921, p. 204; 23. 5 not Bourgery *Rev. Phil.*, XXXVII, 1913, p. 107, but Kronenberg *C.Q.* II, 1908, p. 39; 25. 1 not Favez in edition of 1928 but P. Becker *Ph. W.*, 1922, 550; VII. 15. 5 not Bourgery but A⁵, which he follows; VII. 19. 3 *ii* not Bourgery, who him-

self says Michaelis; VIII. 2. 2 *animum* not Ruhkopf but Lipsius; X. 7. 7 not Hermes but *dett.* (teste Castiglioni) and *uulg.*; XI. 18. 2 not Madvig, who in fact proposed *ex*, but Wesenberg; XII. 14. 3 not Haase but *dett.* On p. 230 proposals are ascribed to Thomas, but their author, P. Thomas, should be distinguished from E. Thomas.

Misprints occur on pp. 10, 38, 47, 58, 153, 177, 179, 225 *pietas* rendered 'pity,' 250, 318, 327 'made' for 'make,' 328, 330, 340, 479 'fostered' for 'fosters.' There are other slips on pp. 39, 96, 223, 395; and on p. 303 for rhythm's sake remove the last 'that.' References are wrong on pp. x, 4, 12, 40, 58, 138, 154, 192, 299, 357. The type of dress mentioned in XII. 16. 4 need not come from Cos, Tac. *Ann.* III. 71 is misrepresented on p. 251, and on p. 33 Coleridge is misquoted with 'message' for 'adage.' The quotations might have included at VI. 22. 3 Hor. *Epod.* XVII. 36; VII. 8. 3 *Aen.* II. 61; 21. 3 Ovid, *Fasti* I. 208; IX. 2. 12 *Aen.* III. 581; 3. 7 Hor. *Odes* II. 18. 21; 12. 4 Lucr. III. 1064; X. 12. 4 Manil. V. 334-6; XII. 13. 6 *nemo ab alio contemnitur nisi a se ante contemptus est* La Rochefoucauld, *Maxime* 322 'il n'y a que ceux qui sont méprisables qui craignent d'être méprisés.' G. B. A. FLETCHER.

University of Liverpool.

L'Empereur Julien. Œuvres Complètes. Tome I.—I^{re} Partie. Discours de Julien César. Texte établi et traduit par J. BIDEZ. Pp. xxx+237. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 40 francs.

The first part of a new edition of Julian's speeches continues the admirable series of works by which M. Bidez has established himself as the foremost authority on the Emperor's life and writings. This volume contains the two panegyrics on Constantius, that on Eusebia, the *Consolation on the Departure of Sallust*, and the famous manifesto to the Athenians. Of these works the eulogy of Eusebia, sincere and comparatively well written, is the most likely to make some general appeal. The remaining pieces are important historically, but are otherwise dreary reading; and (*pace* Gibbon) one feels that elegance and enthusiasm are very ill-balanced in the manifesto.

The last edition of Julian was that of Hertlein, a good scholar, but given to indiscreet atticism and somewhat slack in the task of recension. The text of the present edition is based on a thorough study of existing MSS. and benefits especially by the use of the neglected Vindobonensis (W) and Neapolitanus (Exc. Neap.). Original emendations are few but good; *τοῦ* for *τῷ* on p. 51, l. 4, and *ταῦτα* for *ταῦτα* on p. 53, l. 33, are examples of a great improvement in sense effected by an extremely simple change. In interpretation M. Bidez is generally alert and reliable.

I add notes on a few passages. P. 26, l. 21: does not *παράσχους* need <ἀν> to complete the sense just as much as *μέμφαστο*, l. 25? P. 74, l. 44: Cobet's *ὑποδέξαι* *ἀν* (misprinted in

the critical apparatus) should probably be received into the text. Pp. 143-4, ll. 27-33: this passage about the Veneti contains an interesting digression on the pronunciation of Latin V—will some accredited phonetician elucidate it? P. 226, l. 10: *ἀγων* for *ἀγωντα* may, I suppose, be safely left at the Emperor's door; combined with *ναῦς* as nominative a few lines below, it should have entertained the Athenians.

The translator's prose is competent and agreeable. But at times, lured by verse quotation, he 'drops into poetry' with something of Mr. Wegg's disdain for conventional prosody. I wonder if M. Bidez himself intended the second line of a rhyming couplet to have a thirteenth syllable:

Reviens dans tes foyers, au pays de tes aïeux.

Misprints in the text are much rarer than in some books of this series. P. 12, l. 57, read *περί*; p. 144, line 37, read *παμμεγέθη*. On p. 128, ll. 14-15, and p. 199, l. 47, either the elisions *φῆρ' αἰστος*, *στέρνα τ' ἐξικασμένα* should be made or the phrases should not be printed as literal quotations. W. H. SHEWRING.

Ampleforth College, York.

CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

1931.—January 29. Miss J. R. BACON: Notes on the Orphic *Argonautica*. (Incorporated in C.Q. XXV, 1931, pp. 172-183.) Professor D. S. ROBERTSON: Heracleitus fr. 5 Diels, read *καθαίρονται δ' ἄλλως* (? delete) <αἷμα> αἵματι μαινόμενοι. Eur. *Hipp.* 408, read οὐδ' ἂν στέγη γὰρ οἷς καθηρεφείς δόμοι (i.e. cave-dwellers) καλῶς ἀκριβώσιον. (Summary in *Camb. Univ. Reporter*, February 10, *Proceedings of Camb. Philol. Soc.*, 1931, p. 1.)

February 19. Mr. R. HACKFORTH: A corner of the Socrates-problem. Historically true parts of *Apology* are 21A-23B and the second and third speeches. Mr. C. T. SELTMAN: Pinakia Dikastika. Interpreted the impressions of owls on the Athenian jurymen's tickets. The facing owl is from reverse of triobol, and guarantees dikast's pay, the two-bodied owl from rev. of diobol and guarantees theoric pay. (Summaries in C.U.R., March 3, *Proc.*, 1931.)

March 5. Mr. E. HARRISON: (1) Notes on the vocabulary of Greek tragedy. Figures for reflexives (very rare in Aesch. except *P.V.*). *τύραννος* κτλ. = βασιλεύς unknown before *Oresteia*. (2) Athenaeus 228d, transfer *διὰ τὴν γαστέρα* to main clause, deleting *ἥ*. 237b, read *σατράπης πολυχρόστους καὶ στρατηγούς ἐπιφανεῖς* | *ὑποκρινόμενον ἐν τοῖς βλοῖς, ὁρῶς ἔχον*, | *χιλιοτάλαντους τ' ἀνακυλίων οὐσίας*. 251d, read *Ἐπιτρόπον <τοῦ> τοῦς*. 299c, for *ἐσθ' ἄγων* read *ἀγαστὸν*? (Summary in C.U.R., April 2, *Proc.*, 1931.)

May 14. Mr. J. U. POWELL: Some recent additions to Greek Ilegy and Lyric Poetry. (Incorporated in *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, Third Series*.)

October 22. Mr. J. M. EDMONDS: Some notes on the Greek Elegiac Fragments. (Incorporated in the author's Loeb volumes *Elegy and Iambus*.)

November 5. Mr. F. H. SANDBACH: *Plut. de sera num. uind.* 567A, read *καὶ τὰν ἀντιδόσεων* for *ἐπιδοσεων*. Mr. J. T. SHEPPARD: *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*. Dealt with its literary merits. (Summaries in *C.U.R.*, December 11, *Proc.*, 1931.)

November 26. Professor A. Y. CAMPBELL: *Horace Od. l. xxxii. 15*, read *mihi fi bilinguis* *Od. III. xxvi. 7*, read *cateruae* for *et arcus* *Eur. Andr. 1046* for *ἀνδρ* read *Δαυαῖδus*. (*C.R.* 1932, p. 196 f. Summaries in *C.U.R.*, December 11, *Proc.*, 1931.)

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(OCTOBER, 1932.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—J. Wieneke, *Ezechielis Judaei poetae Alexandrini fabulae quae inscribitur 'Ἐξαιρωγὴ fragmenta* [Münster, 1931, Aschendorff. Pp. 135] (Windfuhr). Careful edition of the fragments, with exact critical apparatus below the text and relevant passages of Septuagint opposite, followed by full commentary. Likely to prove the definitive edition.—*Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein* . . . von E. Fraenkel, H. Fränkel, M. Pohlenz, E. Reitzenstein, R. Reitzenstein, E. Schwartz, J. Stroux [Leipzig, 1931, Teubner. Pp. 168] (Klotz). Contains seven contributions, including papers on Hesiod, Callimachus, Cicero, and Horace. A list of R.'s writings is appended.

LATIN LITERATURE.—M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *P. Vergili Maronis Ciris. Introduzione, testo e commento* [Turin, 1930, Chiantore. Pp. lxvii+123] (Klotz). Reviewer rejects the solution here offered of the authorship of the *Ciris*. The preparation of the text is based on unsound method and the commentary, though containing some useful material, falls far short of being a real explanation of the poem.—J. M. Campbell and M. R. P. McGuire, *The Confessions of*

St. Augustinus, Books I-IX (Selections). With introduction and vocabulary [New York, 1931, Prentice Hall. Pp. x+267] (Tolkiehn). Intended for seminar purposes. Selections mainly from Books I, V, and IX; Book VII not represented. Text is that of P. de Labriolle. Contains nothing original.

HISTORY.—F. Stähelin, *Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage* [Basel, 1931, Schwabe and Co. Pp. 603, with 180 figures, 1 map, and 3 plans] (Gündel). The new edition of this masterly work incorporates the results of research during the intervening four years: there are also some fresh illustrations. The excellent arrangement of the first edition remains unaltered.

EPIGRAPHY.—J. Keil u. A. Wilhelm, *Monumenta Asiae minoris antiqua. Vol. III: Denkmäler aus dem rauhen Kilikien* = Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor [Manchester, 1931, University Press. Pp. xiv+238, with 58 plates, 182 figures, and 801 inscriptions (copied by hand)] (Hiller v. Gaertringen). Grave inscriptions from Korykos form the main part of this valuable collection set in a description of the country, its ancient settlements, and the existing remains of buildings. Splendidly got up thanks to American help.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

*. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Association Guillaume Budé. Congrès de Nîmes, 30 Mars-2 Avril, 1932. Actes du Congrès. Pp. 345. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper.

Bailey (C.) *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*. Pp. ix+340. (Sather Classical Lectures. Vol. 10.) London: Milford, 1932. Cloth, 15s. net.

Beazley (J. D.) and Ashmole (B.) *Greek Sculpture and Painting to the End of the Hellenistic Period*. Pp. xix+107; 248 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Beckmann (P. J. T.) *Das Gebet bei Homer*. Pp. 88. Würzburg: Rita-Verlag, 1932. Paper.

Bellissima (G.) *Marziale. Saggi critici*. Pp. xv+291; 43 photographs. Turin: Paravia, 1931. Paper.

Benz (E.) *Marius Victorinus und die Entwicklung der abendländischen Willensmetaphysik. Erster Band*. Pp. xv+436. (Forschungen zur Kirchen- u. Geistesgeschichte.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, Rm. 32.

Bolisani (E.) *Lucilio e i suoi frammenti (Prima versione italiana)*. Pp. 439. Padua: 'Il Messaggero,' 1932. Paper, L. 30.

Boulanger (A.) *Cicéron. Discours. Tome IX. Sur la loi agraire—Pour C. Rabirius. Texte établi et traduit*. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 20 fr.

Brightfield (M. F.) *The Issue in Literary Criticism*. Pp. xiii+316. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1932. Cloth, 22s. net.

- Burton** (H. E.) *The Discovery of the Ancient World*. Pp. 130; 4 maps. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$1.50 (8s. net).
- Cornford** (F. M.) *Before and after Socrates*. Pp. x+113. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Paper, 4s. 6d. net.
- Dobson** (J. F.) *Ancient education and its meaning to us*. Pp. 205. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London, etc.: Harrap, 1932. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Ducati** (P.) *Pontische Vasen*. (Bilder griechischen Vasen herausgegeben von J. D. Beazley und P. Jacobsthal, Heft 5.) Pp. 26; 27 plates. Berlin: Heinrich Keller, 1932. Paper, RM. 25.
- Düring** (I.) *Porphyrios Kommentar zur Harmonielehre des Ptolemaios*. Herausgegeben von I.D. Pp. xliii+217. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XXXVIII. 1932: 2.) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber. Paper, Kr. 10.
- Hardy** (J.) *Aristote. Poétique. Texte établi et traduit*. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1932. Paper, 16 fr.
- Heath** (Sir T. L.) *Greek Astronomy*. Pp. lvii+192. (The Library of Greek Thought.) London and Toronto: Dent (New York: Dutton), 1932. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Hirschberger** (J.) *Die Phronesis in der Philosophie Platons vor dem Staate*. Pp. vi+200. (Philologus, Supplementband XXV, Heft I.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M. 12.80 (bound, 14.50).
- Housman** (A. E.) *M. Manilii Astronomica*. Recensuit A. E. H. Editio minor. Pp. xvi+181. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Hunt** (A. S.) and **Edgar** (C. C.) *Select papyri*. With an English translation. In two volumes. I.: *Private Affairs*. Pp. xx+452. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Hutton** (P. A.) *Greek Cities*. Pp. xi+24; 64 plates. London: Dent, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Kent** (R. G.) *The sounds of Latin*. A descriptive and historical phonology. Pp. 216. (Language Monographs published by the Linguistic Society of America, No. XII.) Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1932. Paper.
- Kenyon** (F. G.) *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Pp. vii+136; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Magie** (D.) *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. With an English translation. In three volumes. III. Pp. x+529. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Méautis** (G.) *The Mysteries of Eleusis*. Translated from the original French MS. by J. van Isselmuden. Pp. 67; 7 illustrations. Aydar (Madras): Theosophical Publishing House, 1932. Cloth and boards.
- Mickwitz** (G.) *Geld und Wirtschaft im römischen Reich des vierten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Pp. xv+232. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. IV. 2.) Helsingfors: Akademische Buchhandlung (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1932. Paper, Fmk. 170.
- Norwood** (G.) *Plautus and Terence*. Pp. 212. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London, etc.: Harrap, 1932. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Oates** (W. J.) *The Influence of Simonides of Ceos upon Horace*. Pp. 110. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Paper, 11s. 6d. net.
- Oulton** (E. L.) *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History*. With an English translation. In two volumes. II. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Rackham** (H.) *Aristotle. The Politics*. With an English translation. Pp. xxiii+684. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Robinson** (C. E.) *A History of the Roman Republic*. Pp. xi+471; 14 maps. London: Methuen, 1932. Cloth, 6s.
- Rollo** (W.) and **Satchel** (O. J. S.) *Ovid's Metamorphoses*. A Selection, with Introduction, Notes and Index of Proper Names. Pp. xxxii+366. Cape Town: Juta and Co.
- Stefanini** (L.) *Platone*. I. Pp. lxxxi+318. Padua: 'Cedam', 1932. Stiff paper, L. 40.
- Symbolae Philologicae** O. A. Danielsson octogenario dicatae. Pp. x+390. Upsala: Lundequist, 1932. Paper.
- Taylor** (A. E.) *Socrates*. Pp. 182; frontispiece. London: Peter Davies, 1932. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Thomson** (G.) *Aeschylus. The Prometheus Bound*. Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Translation. Pp. vii+184. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Ullman** (B. L.) *Ancient Writing and its Influence*. Pp. vii+224; 16 plates. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) New York: Longmans (London, etc.: Harrap), 1932. Cloth, \$1.75, or 5s. net.
- Vox Graeca**. Griechisches Lesebuch. Das Zeitalter des Hellenismus. I. Der hellenistische Mensch. Herausgegeben von R. Herzog, P. Dittrich, K. Listmann. Pp. x+123; 15 illustrations. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Bound, M. 2.90.
- Waddell** (W. G.) *The Lighter Side of Greek Papyri*. Pp. 21. Low Fell, near Newcastle upon Tyne: C. F. Cutter, 1932. Paper.
- Walser** (E.) *Gesammelte Studien zur Geistesgeschichte der Renaissance*. Mit einer Einführung von W. Kaegi. Pp. xl+359. Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1932. Cloth, 20 Swiss francs.
- Zeller** (F.) *La Filosofia dei Greci nel suo Sviluppo storico*. Parte I. I Presocratici. A cura di R. Mondolfo. Vol. I. Origini, caratteri e periodi della filosofia greca. Pp. xv+425. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia.' Paper, L. 26.

GENERAL INDEX.

Adams (S. M.) Hesiod's Pandora, 193
Adler's Studien zu Philon von Alexandria, 173
Aeschylus' Oresteia at Cambridge, 242
Ailloud's Suetone, 174
Algonquia, 154
Allen's Homer's Ilias and The Homeric Scholia, 12, 13
Altheim's Römische Religionsgeschichte II, 182
Ammann's Der künstlerische Aufbau von Tacitus, Historien I. 12-II. 51: 187
Anderson (J. G. C.) on Moore's *Tac. H. IV-V* and Jackson's *A. I-III*, 39; Macdonald's *Roman Britain 1914-1928*: 132
Anderson (W. E.) on Wuensch's *Lucan-interpretationen*, 270
Asbhy (T.) memoir of, 50
Atkinson (B.) on Owen and Webster's *Excerpta quae ad forum R. spectant*, 33; Mattingly's *Coins of the R. Empire in the B.M. II. 75*
Atzert's edition of Cic. *De Off.*, 274
Australia, classical activities in, 1
Bailey's The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects II, 271
Bains (D.) The date of the codex Vaticanus (C) of Terence, 153
Baker's Constantine the Great and the Christian Revolution, 136
Baldry (H. C.) on Weerts' *Plato u. der Heraklitismus*, 232
Balsdon (J. P. V. D.) on Momigliano's *L'Opera dell' Imperatore Claudio*, 266
Barber (E. A.) on *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein . . . dargebracht*, 126; Cahen's *Callimaque . . . and Coats' Alexandrian Poetry . . .*, 163; *Ammann's Der künstlerische Aufbau von Tac. Hist. I. 12-II. 51*: 187
Barker's The Lover's Manual of Ovid, 38 (cf. 188)
Basore's Seneca: Moral Essays II, 275
Baynes' A List of Books in the English Language on Ancient History for the Use of Teachers in Schools, 84; his *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*, 136
Beazley's Der Berliner Maler, 87
Beazley, Payne, and Price's C.V.A., Great Britain, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Fasc. 2, 160
Bede and Vegetius, 248
Bell (H. I.) on Johnson and van Hoesen's *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, 22; *Papyri Osloenses II*, 23; Gradenwitz' *Heidelberger Konträrindex der gr. Papyrusurkunden*, 44; Hardy's *Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*, 236
Bell, Nock, and Thompson's Magical Texts from a Bilingual Papyrus in the B.M., 180
'Benner Greek', 146
Bevan's The Poems of Leonidas of Tarentum translated into English Verse, 18
Bidez' L'Empereur Julien, Œuvres Complètes. I. i, 276
Bignami's La Poetica di Aristotele e il Concetto dell' Arte presso gli Antichi, 122
Bill's Beiträge zur Lex Porsoniana, 256
Boiaffi's edition of Velleius Paterculus, 89
Boll-Gundel's Sternglauke u. Sternentung, 44
Bonus (A. R.) Hannibal's route over the Alps, 189
BOOKS RECEIVED, 47, 94, 143, 191, 240, 277
Borleffs' Q. Septimi Florentis Terulliani De Baptismo, 91
Bowra (C. M.) on Edmonds' *Elegy and Iambus*, 204
Bryan-Brown (A. N.) on Rennie's edition of Demosthenes, vol. III, 213
Buckland's The Main Institutions of Roman Private Law, 139
Buckler (G.) on Diez and Demus' *Byzantine Mosaics in Greece*, 44
burial of Polynices, 4
Burn's The Romans in Britain, 237
Burnell's Wanderings in Greece, 116
Burton's A Study in Creative History, 250
Byzantios olent lacertos' (Stat. S. 4, 9, 13), 246

279

- D'Agostino's *C. Plinio Cecilio Secundo: Epistole scelte*, 139
- Dahlmann's *Varro u. die hellenistische Sprachtheorie*, 234
- Dale (A. M.) on Howe and Harrer's *Handbook of Classical Mythology*, 176; Lavedan's *Dictionnaire de la Mythologie* . . ., 233
- D'Alton's *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism*, 130
- Davies (G. A.) on Bevan's translation of Leonidas, 18; Pember's *Musa Feriata*, 124
- Dawkins (R. M.) on *Testi Cristiani con versione italiana* . . . II-IV, 41; Sandfeld's *Linguistique balkanique*, 81; Ridgeway's *Early Age of Greece II* and Evans' *Earlier Religion of Greece* . . ., 114; Ljungvik's *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgr. Volkssprache*, 236
- Deferrari's *St. Basil: The Letters*, III, 235
- Deferrari and Campbell's *A Concordance to Prudentius*, 235
- De Graff's *Naevian Studies*, 185
- Delatte's *La catopromancie grecque et ses dérivés*, 260
- Dennison (J. D.) on Sikes' *Greek View of Poetry*, 15; Rabe's *Prolegomenon Sylloge*, 86; Dufour's *Aristote, Rhétorique*, I, 165; Fairbanks' *Philostratus, Imagines: Callistratus, Descriptions*, 174; Cooper's translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, 183; Donnelly's *Persuasive Speech*, 183; Throm's *Die Thesis*, 232
- Derenne's *Les Procès d'Impiété intentés aux Philosophes à Athènes* . . ., 65
- Dicker's *Karakter en Cultuur der Romeinen in Sint Augustinus' De Civitate Dei I-V*, 140
- Dickinson's *The Contribution of Ancient Greece to Modern Life*, 145
- Diederich's *Vergil in the Works of St. Ambrose*, 40
- Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres II*, vi, vii, III, 187
- Diez and Demus' *Byzantine Mosaics in Greece: Hosios Lucas and Daphni*, 44
- Diller's *Die Uebersetzung der hippokratischen Schrift περὶ ἀέρων ὁρίων νόσων*, 182
- Dinsmoor's *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, 123
- Dix (G.) on Casey's *Serapion of Thmuis* . . ., 236
- Donnelly's *Persuasive Speech*, 183
- Duff (A. M.) on Wright's *Cicero and the Theater*, 89; Crump's *The Epyllion* . . ., 184
- Duff (J. D.) on Webster's *Cicero pro Flacco*, 170; Regenbogen's *Lucretius*, 223
- Dufour's *Aristote, Rhétorique I*, 165
- Dunbabin (R. L.) on *die natales*, 2
- Durrbach's *Lycurgue, contre Léocrate et Fragments*, 215
- Duthie's *A Primer of Greek History*, 35
- dux gregis, dux ovium*, 53
- Edmonds' *Elegy and Iambus*, 204 (cf. 255)
- Ehrenberg's *Der griechische u. der hellenistische Staat*, 273
- Eisler's *The Messiah Jesus* . . ., 19
- Eitrem (S.) A note on Erotian, 156
- Eitrem and Amundsen's *Papyri Osloenses, Fasc. II*, 23
- Ἐλευθερίδης: Πηλαργική Ἑλλάς, οἱ Προέλληνες, 137
- Ellis' *A History of Fire and Flame*, 182
- Emploi des signes critiques*, 242
- Ernout and Meillet's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue latine*, 133
- Evans' *The Earlier Religion of Greece in the Light of Cretan Discoveries*, 114
- exposure of children and Greek ethics, 105
- Fairbanks' *Philostratus, Imagines: Callistratus, Descriptions*, 174
- Farnell (L. R.) The restored pronunciation of Latin, 51
- Farnell's text of Pindar and commentary, 205
- Faust's *Die Möglichkeitsgedanke*, 210
- Ferguson's *The Treasurers of Athena*, 259
- Festa's *Teodoro: Terapia dei morbi pagani*, 41
- Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein* . . . dargebracht, 126
- Field (G. C.) on Rick's *Neue Untersuchungen zu platonischen Dialogen*, 232
- Field's *Plato and his Contemporaries*, 68
- FitzGerald's *Alexander of Aphrodisias 'On Destiny' and Peace and War in Antiquity*, 184
- Fletcher (G. B. A.) *Persius I 75-78*: 46. On Watts' *Cicero: pro Milone, etc.*, 129; Fohlen and Humbert's *Cicéron: Tusculanes, t. I*, 171; Basore's *Seneca: Moral Essays, II*, 275
- Fobes' *Benner Greek*, 146
- Fohlen and Humbert's *Cicéron: Tusculanes, t. I*, 171
- Fordyce (C. J.) on Dahlmann's *Varro u. die hellenistische Sprachtheorie*, 234
- Forster (E. S.) on Carteron's *Aristote: Physique, t. II*, 138; Mackail's *The Odyssey translated into Verse*, 203; Durrbach's *Lycurgue, contre Léocrate et Fragments*, 215
- Frank's *Aspects of Social Behavior in Ancient Rome*, 169; his *Cicero*, 275
- Fraser (J.) on Stawell's *Clue to the Cretan Inscriptions*, 180
- Fraser's (H. M.) *Bee-keeping in Antiquity*, 25
- Funaioli's *Essegi Virgiliana Antica*, 228
- Gardner (R.) on a memoir of T. Ashby, 50; Säfslund's *Le Mura di Roma repubblicana*, 220
- Gardner's (E. G.) *Virgil in Italian Poetry*, 25
- garum, 247
- Gaselee (S.) on Waddell's *Book of Medieval Latin for Schools*, 79
- Gaselee's *The Transition from the Late Latin Lyric to the Medieval Love Poem*, 142
- Georgia, *Greek Studies in*, 145
- Gercke-Norden's *Einleitung* . . . (II. 1, III. 3), 273
- Gerstinger's *Griechische literarische Papyri I (Pap. Erz. Rainer)*, 262
- Getty's *The Life of the North Africans as revealed in the Sermons of St. Augustine*, 40
- Giesecke's *Das Ptolemäergeld*, 87
- Gillies (M. M.) on Wendel's *Uebersetzung der Scholien zu Ap. Rhod.*, 233
- Glötz' *La Grèce au V^e Siècle*, 118
- Glover's *Terullian, Apology, De Spectaculis*, 40
- Goldman's *Excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia*, 181
- Gomme (A. W.) on Derenne's *Procès d'Impiété* . . . and Humbert's *Polycrates, l'Accusation de Socrate* . . ., 65; Schneider's *History of World Civilisation*, 218
- Gow (A. S. F.) on Persson's *Royal Tombs at Dendra*, Goldman's *Excavations at Eutresis*, and Smith's *Origin of Chalcidian Ware*, 181
- Grabmann's *Eine lat. Uebersetzung der pseudo-aristotelischen Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 177
- Gradenwitz' *Heidelberger Krontränindex der gr. Papyrussurkunden*, 44
- Granger's *Vitruvius on Architecture*, 29 (cf. 58)
- Granger (F. S.) The text of the Loeb *Vitruvius: a reply*, 58
- Gray (D. H.) on some class-books, 83
- Greece and Rome, II. 1*, 241
- Griffin's *Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct*, 121
- Gulchies' *Athenaeus, vol. IV*, 39
- Guthrie (W. K. C.) on Moore's *Ancient Beliefs in the Immortality of the Soul*, 159
- Haarhoff's *Vergil in the Experience of S. Africa*, 227
- Hackforth (R.) On two passages in Aristotle's *Ethics*, 5. On Harward's *Platonic Epistles*, 212
- Hadrian's Wall, 249
- Hahn's *Coordination of Non-coordinate Elements in Vergil*, 25
- Hall (F. W.) on Collomp's *Critique des Textes*, 141
- Halliday (W. R.) on Herzog's *Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus*, 17; Glötz' *La Grèce au V^e Siècle*, 118; Delatte's *Catopromancie grecque*, 260; Gercke-Norden's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (II. 1, III. 3), 273
- Hallward (B. L.) on Scullard's *Scipio Africanus in the Second Punic War*, 24
- Hanell's *Das Menologium des Liber Glossarum*, 274
- Hannibal's march over the Alps, 189
- Hardie (C. G.) on Grabmann's *Eine lat. Uebersetzung der ps.-ar. Rhet. ad Alex. and Lobel's Medieval Latin Poetics*, 177
- Hardy's *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*, 236

- Harrison (E.)** on Gulick's *Athenaeus*, vol. IV, 39;
 Todd's *Index Aristophaneus*, 231; Jacoby's *Theognis*,
 252; Bill's *Beiträge zur Lex Porsoniana*, 256
Harward's *The Platonic Epistles*, 212
Havers' Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax, 80
Headlam (W.) Greek elegiacs (to Aeschylus) and ver-
 sion, 193
Heath (J. L.) on Rome's *Pappus d'Alexandrie* . . ., 185
Hege-Rodenwaldt's *The Acropolis*, 231
Heintz' Studien zu Sextus Empiricus, 211
Heitland (W. E.) on Showerman's *Rome and the*
Romans, 69
Herter's *De Priapo*, 158
Herzog's *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, 17
Hesiod's *Pandora*, 193
Hesperia I. 1, 50
Hill (H.) on Cic. de domo sua xxxiii. 87: 46. Tacitus,
Annals XIV. 21. 2: 152
Holmes' The Architect of the Roman Empire, II, 28
Hope's *The Book of Diogenes Laertius*, 88
Horace and Augustus, 243
Housman (A. E.) Three new lines of Lucan? 150.
 On Boll-Gundel's *Sterngläub u. Sterndeutung*, 44;
 Labriolle's *Satires de Juvénal*, 131 (cf. 189)
Housman's *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, 90
Howe and Harter's *A Handbook of Classical Mythology*,
 176
Huchtermeyer's *Aulos und Kithara*, 233
Hude's *Xenophontis Expeditio Cyri*, 209
Hudson's *Europe and China*, 175
Huemers *Das tragische Dreigestirn u. seine modernen*
Bewerter, 37
Humbert's *Polycrates, l'Accusation de Socrate, et le*
Gorgias, 65
Illig's *Zur Form der pinarischen Erzählung*, 231
Immisch's *Horazens Epistel über die Dichtkunst erklärt*,
 223
inglorius, ingloriosus, 152
Jackson's (J.) translation of Tacitus, *Ann.* I-III: 39
Jackson's (T.) translation of Lucretius, 37
Jacoby's *Theognis*, 252
**James' The Potential Subjunctive in Independent Sentences
in Livy, 38
Johnson (A. C.) and van Hoesen's *Papyri in the Prince-*
ton University Collections, 22
Johnson's (F. P.) *Corinth, IX, Sculpture*, 1896-1923: 64
Johnson (S. K.) on James' *Potential Subjunctive in In-*
dependent Sentences in Livy, 38; *Neue Wege zur Antike*
VIII, 92
Jones (C. W.) *Bede and Vegetius*, 248
Jones's (L. W.) *The Script of Cologne from Hildebald to*
Hermann, 272
Jones and Morey's *The Miniatures of the MSS of*
Terence prior to the Thirteenth Century, 221
Jones (W. H. S.) on Raeder's *Oribasii Collectionum*
Medicinarum reliquiae, III, 141
Jones' Hippocrates, IV, and Heracleitus 'On the Uni-
 verse', 85
Judeich's *Topographie von Athen*, 137
Julian's *Au Seuil de notre Histoire*, II, III, 43
**Junghanns' Die Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Meta-
morphosen u. ihrer Vorlage, 235
Kappler's *De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum*, 186
Kean's *Memoranda Latina*, 84
Keith (C.) on Bignami's *Poetica di Aristotele* . . . and
 Owen's *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* . . ., 122
Kennedy and Mountford's *The Revised Latin Primer*, 83
Kirtland's *Ritchie's Fabulae Faciles*, 36
Knight (W. F. J.) *Animamque superbam*, 55 (cf. 199).
 On Stein's *Röm. Inschriften in der antiken Literatur*,
 168; Cesareo's *Poesia di Calpurnio Siculo*, 267, and
Tragedie di Seneca, 269
Kroll's (J.) *Gott und Hölle: der Mythos vom Descensus-*
kampfe, 230
Kroll's (W.) *Die Kosmologie des Plinius*, 187
Kurfess' C. Sallusti Crispi Ad Caesarem Senem De Re
Publica, 38
Labriolle's *Les Satires de Juvénal*, 131 (cf. 189)
lacertus, 246
Laistner's *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, 500 to*
900 A.D., 78
Lamb (W.) on Beazley's *Der Berliner Maler*, 87;
C.V.A., Great Britain, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum,
Fasc. 2, 160
Lammert's *Die römische Tahtik zu Beginn der Kaiserzeit*
u. die Geschichtschreibung, 271
Latin poets in the British Parliament, 97
Laurence's (Sir P. M.) bequest to Cambridge, 2
Lavedan's *Dictionnaire de la Mythologie et des Antiquités*
grecques et romaines, 233
Lawrence (A. W.) on Suhr's *Sculptured Portraits of*
Greek Statesmen . . ., 184
Lawson's *Aeschylus: The Agamemnon. A Revised Text*
with Introduction, Verse Translation, and Critical Notes,
 161
Leaf's *Walter Leaf: Some Chapters of Autobiography*
with a Memoir, 145
Leopar (A.) on Vergilian celebrations in Australia, 1
Lenz's edition of Ovid's *Fasti*, 275
Levens (R. G. G.) on Jackson's translation of Lucre-
 tius, 37
Lewis and Goddard's *Foundations for Latin Prose Com-*
position, 83
Licht's *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece*, 142
Lindholm's *Statistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satz-*
glieder im Lateinischen, 220
Lindsay (A. D.) on Shorey's *Plato, Republic, I-V*, 14
Lister (H.) on some class-books, 35
Livingstone (R. W.) on Chapman's *Lucian, Plato and*
Greek Morals, 37; Dickinson's *Contribution of Ancient*
Greece to Modern Life, 145
Ljungvik's *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätr. Volkssprache*,
 236
Lobel's *The Medieval Latin Poetics*, 177
Loenen's *Vrijheid en Gelijheid in Athene*, 274
Lorimer (H. L.) on Lawson's *Aesch. Agam.*, 161
Lorimer (W. L.) *Thucydides VI. 11, 87: 155. Plato,*
Laws 905a: 156. On Hope's *Book of Diogenes*
Laertius, 88
Lucas (D. W.) on Barker's *The Lover's Manual of Ovid*,
 38 (cf. 188); Martin's edition of Marlowe's poems
 188
Luckhurst (K. W.) on Field's *Plato and his Contempor-*
aries, 68
ludi Graeci, 152
Lyngby's *Textkritiska Studier till Celsus' Medicina*, 139
Macdonald's *Roman Britain 1914-1928*, 132; his *Agri-*
cola in Britain, 146
Macgregor (D. C.) on Loenen's *Vrijheid en Gelijheid in*
Athene, 274
Mackail (J. W.) *Virgil, Georgics II. 39-45: 199*
Mackail's *The Odyssey translated into Verse*, 203
MacKay (L. A.) *Horace, Odes III. 4: Date and inter-*
pretation, 243. *Horace, Epistles, I. 2. 30-31: 245*
McKenzie (E.) on Margadant's *Lexilogus*, 45; *Thack-*
cray's Lexicon to Josephus, Part I, 76; *Ἐλευθεριάδης:*
Πελοποννησιακῆς Ἑλλάδος, 137
Macurdy's *Hellenistic Queens*, 167
Marchant (E. C.) on Hude's *Xenophontis Expeditio Cyri*
and Masqueray's *Xén., Anabasis, t. II*, 209
Marchant and Watson's *Latin Grammar*, 35
Margadant's *Lexilogus*, 45
Marsh's *The Reign of Tiberius*, 264
Martin *Classical Lectures, I*, 34 (cf. 92)
Martin's edition of Marlowe's poems, 188
Masqueray's *Xénophon, Anabasis, t. II*, 209
Mattingly's *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British*
Museum, II, 75
Meiggs (R.) on Ferguson's *The Treasurers of Athena*,
 259
Meiklejohn (K. W.) *The burial of Polynices*, 4
Meillet's *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine*, 238
Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, IX, 45
Meritt's *Corinth, VIII. I, Greek Inscriptions*, 1896-1927:
 63
Milne (H. J. M.) *A line of the Iambi of Callimachus*, 250****

- Milne's (J. G.) *Greek Coinage*, 88
 Minns (E. H.) on Greek studies in Georgia, 145
 Misch's *Geschichte der Autobiographie*, I, 127
 Momigliano's *L'Opera dell' Imperatore Claudio*, 266
 Moon (E. O.) on Bailey's *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects*, II, 271
 Mooney's *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum Libri VII-VIII*, 32
 Moore's (C. H.) *Ancient Beliefs in the Immortality of the Soul*, 159
 Moore's *Tacitus, The Histories (Books IV-V) and Jackson's The Annals (Books I-III)*, 39
 Moore (E. W.) on *Serta Leodiensia und Charisteria A. Rzsch* . . . dargebracht, 42; *Serta Rudbergiana*, 43; *D'Agostino's C. Plinio Cecilio Secundo: Epistole scelte*, 139; *Licht's Sexual Life in Ancient Greece*, 142
 Mountford (J. F.) on Hanell's *Das Menologium des Liber Glossarum*, 274
 Mure (G. R. G.) on Griffin's *Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct*, 121; Fitzgerald's *Alexander of Aphrodisias 'On Destiny' and Peace and War in Antiquity*, 184
 Murison's *Horace rendered into English Verse*, 186
 Murray (G.) on Allen's *Homeri Ilias and The Homeric Scholia*, 12; *Volmer's De Euripidis fabula quae Phaëdon inscribitur restituenda*, 208
 Musée Belge summarized, 190
 Myres (J. L.) on Schaal's *Vom Tauschhandel zum Welt-handel*, 61; Burton's *Creative History*, 250
 Neophilologus (1932), 242
 Neue Wege zur Antike VIII, 92
 Newell (A. N.) on Jullian's *Au Seuil de notre Histoire*, II, III, 43; Stümpel's *Name u. Nationalität der Germanen*, 236; Carcopino's *Ce que Rome et l'Empire Romain doivent à la Gaule*, 237
 Niccolini's *Il tribunato della plebe*, 169
 Nilsson's *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*, 157
 Noble (P. S.) on some Virgiliana, 25; Ernout and Meillet's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue latine*, 133; Tucker's *Concise Etymological Dictionary of Latin*, 134; Walde-Hofmann's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch IV*, 141; Lindholm's *Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder im Lateinischen*, 229
 Nock (A. D.) on Reinach and Blum's *Flavius Josephus: Contre Apion*, 39; Colson and Whittaker's *Philos. vols. I-III and Adler's Studien zu Philon*, 173; Kappler's *De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum*, 186; Kroll's *Kosmologie des Plinius*, 187; Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, II, vi, vii, III, 187
 Nordström's *Poseidon och hans ΣΚΗΠΑΝΙΟΝ and Om Hermes ΧΡΥΣΟΠΑΡΙΣ*, 182
 Norwood's *Greek Comedy*, 118
 Ombi, 131, 189
 O'Neill's *Ancient Corinth, Part I*, 62
 Ovid's style, 188
 Owen (A. S.) on *The Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. I*, 34 (cf. 92); Huemer's *Das tragische Dreigestirn* . . . 37; Whibley's *Companion to Greek Studies*, 125; *Classical Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe*, 178
 Owen's *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry: An Analytic Commentary and Notes*, 122
 Owen and Webster's *Excerpta ex antiquis scriptoribus quae ad forum Romanum spectant*, 33
 Pandora, 193
 Pantin (W. E. P.) on Havers' *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*, 80
 Parker (H. M. D.) on Lammert's *Die römische Taktilik* . . . 271
 Patterson's *Irregular Latin Verbs*, 36
 Peck (A. L.) on Jones' *Hippocrates, vol. iv, etc.*, 85; Diller's *Uebersetzung der hippokratischen Schrift π. ἀφρον ὑδάτων νόσων*, 182; Chambry's *Platon, La République*, i-iii, 258
 Pember's *Musa Feriata*, 124
 Pernice's *Griechisches u. römisches Privatleben*, 273
 Persson's *The Royal Tombs at Dendra near Midea*, 181
 Petz (J. A.) on Whimster's *Archaeology of Surrey*, 188; Collingwood's *Roman Britain and Burn's Romans in Britain*, 237
 Philologische Wochenschrift summarized, 46, 93, 191, 239, 277
 Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on Norwood's *Greek Comedy*, 118; Zielinski's *Iresione*, I, 183
 Pignaniol's *La Conquête romaine*, 185
 Plasberg's edition of Cicero *De Virtutibus*, 274
 Platnauer (M.) on Reusch's *Der historische Wert der Caracallavita*, 77; Rehm's *Das geographische Bild des alten Italien in Vergils Aeneis*, 227
 plot-construction in Sophocles, 146
 Pomoell's *Textkritische Studien till Columellas Fenne Bok*, 91
 Poterat's *Selected Letters of Cicero*, 83
 Potter (K. R.) on Conway's *Makers of Europe*, 70 (cf. 202); Lenz's edition of Ovid's *Fasti*, 275
 Powell (J. E.) Herodotus III. 99: a modern parallel, 11. A note on Sophocles' *Ajax*, 155. The cost of the Propylaea, 250
 Powell (J. U.) on Gerstinger's *Griechische literarische Papyri I*, 262
 Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences, Congress of, 2
 Preisendanz's *Die gr. Zauberpapyri II*, 84
 progressus, 243
 pronunciation of Latin, 51 (cf. 241)
 Propylaea, cost of the, 250
 Rabe's *Prolegomenon Sylloge*, 86
 Raby (F. J. E.) on Laistner's *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, 500 to 900 A.D.*, 78; Gaselee's *Transition from the Late Latin Lyric to the Medieval Love Poem*, 142
 Rackham (H.) *Aristotle Poetics*, XXV. 6, 1460b 34: 156
 Radet's *Alexandre le Grand*, 16
 Raeder's *Oribasii Collectionum Medicarum reliquiae*, vol. III, 141
 Ramsay (W. M.) Tyraion, 154. Tyraion again, 203
 Rattenbury (E. M.) on Wright's *History of Later Greek Literature* . . . 165
 Regenbogen's *Lucretius: Seine Gestalt in seinem Gedicht*, 223
 Rehm's *Das geographische Bild des alten Italien in Vergils Aeneis*, 227
 Reinach and Blum's *Flavius Josephus: Contre Apion*, 39
 Rendall's *Minucius Felix*, 40
 Rennie's *Demosthenes Orationes*, t. III, 213
 Reusch's *Der historische Wert der Caracallavita*, 77
 Revue des Études homériques, 193
 Richardson (G. W.) on Baynes's *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* and Baker's *C. the Great and the Christian Revolution*, 136
 Rick's *Neue Untersuchungen zu platonischen Dialogen*, 232
 Ridgeway's *The Early Age of Greece*, II, 114
 Ritter's *Sokrates und Platonische Liebe*, 210
 Robertson (D. S.) on Granger's *Vitruvius*, 29 (cf. 58); *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, IX, 45; Farnell's *Pindar*, vols. II, III, 205; Hege and Rodenwaldt's *Acropolis and Illig's Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung*, 231; Junghanns' *Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Metamorphosen*, 235
 Robertson's (J. J.) *Lower Latin Sentences*, 84
 Robinson's (C. A.) *The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition*, 216
 Robinson's (D. M.) *Excavations at Olynthus (IV)*, 21 (III), 86
 Robinson (E. S. G.) on Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus III*, 86; Giesecke's *Ptolemäergeld*, 87
 Rohr's *Platons Stellung zur Geschichte*, 211
 Rome's *Pappus d'Alexandrie: Commentaire sur les livres 5 et 6 de l'Almageste*, 185
 Rose (H. J.) Three notes on Aeschylus, 11 (cf. 155). Once more Aeschylus, *Septem*, 13-12: 203. On Preisendanz's *Die gr. Zauberpapyri II*, 84; Staehle's

- Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria*, 85; Cooke's *Osiris*, 139; Nilsson's *Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*, 157; Wilamowitz' *Glaube der Hellenen II* and Herter's *De Priapo*, 158; Bell's *Magical Texts from a Bilingual Papyrus*, 180; Sjövall's *Zeus im altgriechischen Haushalt*, 181; Nordström's *Poseidon . . . and Om Hermes . . .*, Ellis' *History of Fire and Flame*, and Altheim's *Röm. Religionsgeschichte II*, 182; Kroll's *Gott und Hölle*, 230; Vitali's *Fonti per la Storia della Religione cyrenaica*, 274
- Ross (W. D.)** on Wingate's *Mediaeval Latin Versions of the Aristotelian Scientific Corpus*, 85
- Sabbadini's P. Vergili Maronis Opera, 26**
- Säffund's Le Mura di Roma repubblicana**, 220
- Sandbach (F. H.)** on Sabbadini's *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 26; Sparrow's *Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil*, 73
- Sandfield's Linguistique balkanique, problèmes et résultats**, 81
- Sayce (A. H.)** The Phrygian hero Tyris, 11 (cf. 154, 203)
- Schaal's *Vom Tauschhandel zum Welthandel*, 61
- Schmitt's *Akzent und Diphthongierung*, 237
- Schneider's *The History of World Civilisation*, 218
- Schroeter's *De regum hellenisticorum epistulis in lapidibus seroatis quaestiones stylisticae*, 138
- scomber, 247
- Scullard's *Scipio Africanus in the Second Punic War*, 24
- Sedgwick (W. B.)** ΗΟΑΑΑ ΗΟΑΑΩΝ (Pap. Oxy. IV. 744), 12
- Sedgwick's *Iohannis Historia*, 84
- Serta Leodiensia*, 42
- Serta Rudbergiana*, 43
- Shewan (A.)** on *Revue des Études homériques*, 193
- Shewring (W. H.)** on Bidez' *Julien, Œuvres Complètes*, t. I, 4, 276
- Shorey (P.)** letter from, 92
- Shorey's *Plato: The Republic, Books I-V*, 14
- Showerman's *Rome and the Romans*, 69
- Sikes' *The Greek View of Poetry*, 15
- Sjögren's *Cicero's ad Atticum Epistularum, lib. V-VIII*, 71
- Sjövall's *Zeus im altgriechischen Haushalt*, 181
- Skard's *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe: Euergetes-Concordia*, 233
- Smith's (H. R. W.) *The Origin of Chalcidian Ware*, 181
- Smith (W. K.)** on Ailloud's *Suétone*, 174; Woodhouse's *The Fight for an Empire*, 187
- Solon's property classes, 2
- Sophocles, plot-construction in, 146
- Souter (A.)** Three new lines of Lucan, 114 (cf. 150). Notes on the transmission of Lucan's text, 150. A probable fragment of Cicero's *De Gloria*, 151. On Glover's *Tertullian* and Rendall's *Minucius Felix*, Comeau's *La Rhétorique de St. Augustin*, and Catholic University of America, *Patristic Studies*, XXVIII, XXIX, 40; Housman's *Iuvenalis Satyrae*, 90; Wessner's *Scholien in Iuvenalem Vetustiora*, Pomoell's *Textkritische Studien till Columellas Feste Bok*, and Borleffs' *Tertulliani De Baptismo*, 91; Lyngby's *Textkr. Stud. till Celsus' Medicina*, 139; Wiman's *Textkr. Stud. till Arnobius*, Springer's *Nature-Imagery in . . . St. Ambrose*, and Dicker's *Karakter en Cultuur der Romeinen in Sint Augustinus . . .*, 140; Witte's *Geschichte der röm. Dichtung im Zeitalter des Augustus*, II. ii, 186; Deferari and Campbell's *Concordance to Prudentius*, 235; Jones' *Script of Cologne . . .*, 272
- Sparrow's *Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil*, 73
- Springer's *Nature-Imagery in the Works of Saint Ambrose*, 140
- Staehele's *Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria*, 85
- Stawell's *A Clue to the Cretan Inscriptions*, 180
- Stein's *Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur*, 168
- Stenzel's *Studien zur Entwicklung der platonischen Dialektik*, 211
- Stenart (E. M.)** on De Graff's *Nasvian Studies*, 185
- Stevenson (G. H.)** on Holmes' *Architect of the Roman Empire*, II, 28; Wells and Barrow's *Short History of the Roman Empire*, 74; Piganiol's *Conquête romaine*, 185
- Stevenson's *The Roman Empire*, 28
- Stümpel's *Name u. Nationalität der Germanen*, 236
- Stürenburg's *Relative Ortsbezeichnung*, 251
- Subr's *Sculptured Portraits of Greek Statesmen . . .*, 184
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 46, 93, 190, 238, 277
- superbia, 55 (cf. 199)
- Tarn (W. W.)** on Rade's *Alexandre le Grand*, 16; van der Mijnsbrugge's *The Cretan Koinon*, 86; Dinsmoor's *Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, 123; Schroeter's *De regum hellenisticorum epistulis . . . quaestiones stylisticae*, 138; Macurdy's *Hellenistic Queens and Cornelius' Cannae*, 167; Wilcken's *Alexander the Great and Robinson's Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition*, 216; Cary's *History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B.C.*, 217; Skard's *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe*, 233; Vieillefond's *Jules Africain: Fragments des Cestes*, 238; Cross's *Epirus*, 261
- Tarrant (D.)** on German works on Greek philosophy, 210
- Tate (J.)** on Murison's verse-rendering of Horace, 186
- Taylor's *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 225
- Terence, date of the codex Vaticanus (C) of, 153
- Terzaghi's *Per la Storia della Satira*, 263
- Thackeray's *A Lexicon to Josephus, Part I*, 76
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (1932) announced, 242
- Thompson (D'A. W.)** ΚΤΙΑΟΞ, 53. 'Byzantios olent lacertos' (Stat. S. 4, 9, 13), 246
- Thomson (J. O.)** on Hudson's *Europe and China*, 175
- Throm's *Die Thesis*, 232
- Thursby and Kyne's *Living Latin, Book II*, 36
- Tod (M. N.)** on Meritt's *Corinth, VIII*, I, 63
- Todd (F. A.)** PROGRESSVS VTERQVE, 243
- Todd's (O. J.)** *Index Aristophanens*, 231
- trachurus*, 247
- Treble and King's *Everyday Life in Rome . . .*, 35
- Tremenheere (B. G.)** on his *Propertius*, 93
- Tucker's *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Latin*, 134
- Turkish translations from Latin, 145
- Turner's (C. H.) *The oldest MS of the Vulgate Gospels*, 41
- Turner (J. W. C.)** on Buckland's *Main Institutions of Roman Private Law*, 139
- Turner (E. L.)** on Schmitt's *Akzent u. Diphthongierung*, 237; Meillet's *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine*, 238
- Tyraion, 154, 203
- Tyris, 11 (cf. 154, 203)
- Ullman, Henry, and White's *Third Latin Book*, 36
- van der Mijnsbrugge's *The Cretan Koinon*, 86
- Vergil and Octavian, 199
- Vergilian celebrations in Australia, 1. Date of bimillenary, 2
- Vesey (W. T.)** on Sjögren's *Cic. ad Att. Epist. fasc. ii*, 71
- Vieillefond's *Jules Africain: Fragments des Cestes*, 238
- Vince (C. A.)** Latin poets in the British Parliament, 97
- Vitali's *Fonti per la Storia della Religione cyrenaica*, 274
- Volmer's *De Euripidis fabula quas Pædow inscribitur restituenda*, 208
- Wace (A. J. B.)** on Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus IV*, 21; Johnson's *Corinth IX*, 64
- Waddell's *A Book of Medieval Latin for Schools*, 79
- Walde-Hofmann's *Lat. etymologisches Wörterbuch IV*, 141
- Wason (C. E.)** on O'Neill's *Ancient Corinth, I*, 62
- Watts' *Cicero Pro Milone etc.*, 129
- Webster (T. B. L.)** Plot-construction in Sophocles, 146. On Atzert's and Plasberg's *Cic. De Off. and De Virt.*, 274
- Webster's *M. Tulli Ciceronis pro Flacco Oratio*, 170
- Weerts' *Plato and der Heraklitismus*, 232
- Wells and Barrow's *A Short History of the Roman Empire . . .*, 74

- Wendel's *Die Uebersetzung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos*, 233
 Wessner's *Scholien in Juvenalem Vetusiora*, 91
 West's *Roman Britain: The Objects of Trade*, 140
 Whibley's *A Companion to Greek Studies*, 125
 Whimster's *The Archaeology of Surrey*, 188
 Wight Duff (J.) on D'Alton's *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism*, 130; Frank's *Aspects of Social Behavior in Ancient Rome*, 169; Immisch's *Horazens Epistel über die Dichtkunst erklärt*, 223; Terzaghi's *Per la Storia della Satira*, 263; Frank's *Cicero*, 275
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Der Glaube der Hellenen II*, 158
 Wilcken's *Alexander the Great*, 216
 Wiman's *Textkritische Studien till Arnobius*, 140
 Wingate's *The Mediaeval Latin Versions of the Aristotelian Scientific Corpus* . . . , 85
 Winnington-Ingram (R. P.) on Huchzermeyer's *Aulos und Kithara*, 233
 Witte's *Die Geschichte der röm. Dichtung im Zeitalter des Augustus: Horazens Lyrik*, 186
 Wood (E. J.) on Bolaffi's *Velleius Paterculus*, 89
 Woodhouse's *The Fight for an Empire*, 187
 Woodward (A. M.) *ΑΣΤΑΤΟΣ*, 9. On Burnell's *Wanderings in Greece*, 116; Judeich's *Topographie von Athen*, 137
 Wright's (F. A.) *A History of Later Greek Literature* . . . , 165
 Wright's (F. W.) *Cicero and the Theater*, 89
 Wuensch's *Lucan-interpretationen*, 270
 Wuthnow's *Die semitischen Menschnennamen in griech. Inschriften u. Papyri des vorderen Orients*, 234
 Zielifski's *Iresione, Tomus I*, 183
 Zimmermann's *Der Sallusttext im Altertum*, 45

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given page.

- Aeschylus *Ag.* 551-82: 11; *passim*, 161. *Pers.* 321: 256; 732: 54. *Sept.* 12 f.: 11, 155, 203; 135: 11
 Aristophanes *Ach.* 1128: 260. *Frogs* 1190: 106. *Kn.* 539: 120. *Wasps* 289: 107
 Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* VII: 2. *Eth. N.* 1173a 5-13: 5; 1174b 14 ff.: 6. *H.A.* 573b 25: 53. *Post.* 1460b 34: 156; *passim*, 178. *Rhet.* I *passim*: 165
 Athenaeus 228d, 237b, 251d, 299e: 276. 331-459 *passim*: 39
 B.S.A. XVII, p. 231, No. 9: 9
 Bede *De Temp. Rat.* 28, 29, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 5, *Retract.* in *Acta* 28: 248 f.
 Callimachus *Iambi* (P.S. I. 1094): 250
 Callistratus *Descriptions* 2: 175
 Calpurnius Siculus *passim*: 267
 Cicero *Ad Att.* V-VIII *passim*: 71. *De Domo Sua* xxxiii 87: 46. *De Gloria*: 151. *Pro Flacco* 26: 171. *Pro Mil.*, *In Pis.*, *Pro Scauro.*, *Pro Font.*, *Pro Rab. Post.*, *Pro Marc.*, *Pro Lig.*, *Pro Deit.* *passim*: 129. *Tusc. Disp.* *passim*: 171
 C.L.E. 2121: 43
 Crates (com.) fr. 15: 120
 Demosthenes XLI ff. *passim*: 213
 Diogenes Laertius ii. 7: 65
 Erotian *Voc. Hippocr. Coll.* praef. 34 Kl.: 156
 Euripides *Andr.* 117 ff.: 43; 346: 256; 1037-46: 196, 277. *Hec.* 729: 256. *Hipp.* 468: 276; 556: 252. *Ion* 1: 256. *Phaethon* *passim*: 208. *Rhes.* 868: 256. *Tro.* 380 f.: 196. *Fr.* 362, 2, 1132: 256
 Harpocration s.v. *Πρωτόλαια*: 250
 Heraclitus fr. 5 Diels: 276
 Herodotus I. 47: 203. III. 99: 11
 Hesiod *O. et D.* 80 ff. etc.: 193
 Homer *Il.* III. 196. XIII. 491. *Od.* IX. 432: 53
 Horace *Carm.* I. xxii. 15, III. xxvi. 7: 277; III. v: 243. *Epist.* I. ii. 30 f.: 245. *Epod.* xvii *passim*: 256 f.
 Jerome *In Evang. Matth.* I (on v. 12): 151
 Josephus *C. Apion.* II. 255: 39
 Julian *Speeches as Caesar* *passim*: 276
 Juvenal *passim*: 131, 189
 Livy IX. 18. 12, XXXV. 16. 4: 38. XXI. 18. 13: 43
 Lucan II. 594, V. 197: 151. VII. 303 ff.: 114, 150. VII *passim*: 270
 Lucretius I. 393 f., 979: 37
 Lycurgus *passim*: 215
 Minucius Felix *passim*: 40
 Pap. Gr. Mag. II: 84. Pap. Oslo, fasc. II: 23. Pap. Oxy. IV. 744: 12. Pap. Rainer, N.S. I: 262
 Persius I. 75-8: 46
 Petronius *Ad init.*: 173
 Philo *De Plantatione* 156: 173
 Philostratus *Imagines* *passim*: 175
 Pindar *passim*: 205
 Plato *Epist.* *passim*: 212. *Eryx.* 393B: 156. *Laws* 905A: 156
 Plutarch *De Is. et Os.* 360b: 250. *De Sera Num. Vind.* 567a: 277. *Solon* xxiii. 5, 10: 3
 Polybius III. 113-6: 167
 Priapea ii. 9: 42
 Quintilian *I.O. X. i. 6*: 43
 Seneca *Dial.* VI-XII *passim*: 275. *Trag.* *passim*: 269
 Solon's 'tetrameters': 257
 Sophocles *Al.* 624 ff.: 155; 1101: 256. *Ant.* *passim*: 4. *El.* 413: 256. *O.C.* 1452 f.: 43. *Phil.* 22: 256
 Statius *Silv.* IV. 9. 13: 246
 Suetonius *passim*: 174. *Galb.-Dom.* *passim*: 32
 Tacitus *Ann.* XII. 69: 190. XIV. 21. 2: 152
 Tertullian *Apol.* and *De Spectac.* *passim*: 40
 Theocritus VII. 69 f.: 43. XVI. 60: 203
 Theognis *passim*: 252
 Thucydides VI. 11: 7: 155
 Velleius Paterculus *passim*: 90
 Vergil *passim*: 26. *Aen.* VI. 817 f.: 55, 199; XI. 608 f.: 243. *Georg.* II. 39-45: 199
 Vitruvius *passim*: 29, 58
 Xenophon *Anab.* *passim*: 209. *Cyrop.* *passim*: 209

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

αἰλιος, 155
 δαυλος, δαυλος (δαυλωτος), 9
 βιαύω, 67
 δαυλαῖα, 197
 δῶ, 43
 ἐγχευρισμός, 107
 ἐνθηρος, 11
 ἐπίσκεψις, 43
 ἐπισχερώ, 55
 ἐβεργέτης, 234
 ἐφ' ὃ πάρε, 12

κοινωδικαίον, 86
 κόλιας, 246
 κράμβος, 120
 Μανικά (Phryg. μαγκα), 250
 μένειν μετὰ γυνεκής, 250
 μέτρα θαλάσσης, 203
 ὁμόνοια, 10, 234
 πεντακοσιομέδιμνος, 3
 πολλά πολλῶν, 12
 προσφιλοτεχνέ, 121

σαῖρος, 246
 σκόμβρος, σκουμπρί, 246
 σκούω, 84
 στόμα of a stream, 252
 συντάξιμον, 22
 στέλη, 85
 τέλη (of Solon), 2
 πράχουρος, 246
 τῖραννος in tragedy, 276
 τυρίμνος, 11

's Aulos

alter des

39

urnell's

phie von

literature

griech.

e.

13 : 43

14, 150.

3. Pap.

62

Laws

m. Vind.

passim :

passim :

22 : 256

32

99 ; XI.

n : 209

246

52

276

HORACE

RENDERED IN ENGLISH VERSE

This book contains The Odes, The Secular Hymn, The Epodes, The Satires, The Epistles, and The Art of Poetry.

'To present the whole works of Horace in English verse is a performance requiring taste and scholarship and a good ear for the harmonies of English metre. Mr. Murison has boldly adventured this feat, and is to be congratulated on the accuracy and on the vigour of his version.'—*Oxford Magazine*.

ALEXANDER FALCONER
MURISON, LL.D.

12s. 6d. net

THE BUCOLICS AND GEORGICS OF VERGIL

RENDERED IN ENGLISH HEXAMETERS

'The translation is remarkably close to the sense of the original . . . the version is well worth reading, as the result of loving labour at a task which fascinates by its sheer impossibility.'—*Scotsman*.

ALEXANDER FALCONER
MURISON, LL.D.

7s. 6d. net

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.,
39 Paternoster Row LONDON, E.C. 4

Latin Text-Books

A SCHOOL LATIN COURSE

By G. A. MORRISON, M.A., LL.D., Headmaster of Robert Gordon's College, Aberdeen. An attempt by an experienced and successful teacher to give the rudiments of Latin through translation of complete sentences from the very first. It provides material for a three or four years' course. Part I., 2s. 6d.; Part II., 3s.; Part III., 3s.

LATIN TRANSLATION AT SIGHT

By T. D. HALL, M.A. Contains three hundred and fifty-five Latin passages of graduated difficulty well adapted for school use up to Matriculation standard. Limp cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth boards, 1s. 9d.; Key, 1s. 8d.

LATIN LITERATURE

By J. W. MACKAIL, LL.D., F.B.A. The Republic—The Augustan Age—The Empire—Index of Authors. 7s. net.

'Without a doubt the best and most complete work of its kind in English.'—*Daily News*.

LIMEN

A First Latin Book. By C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A., and R. S. CONWAY, F.B.A., Litt.D. 4s. Also in Two Parts. 2s. 6d. each. Teachers' Edition, including APPENDIX TO LIMEN, 5s.; Key, 3s. 3d., post free. APPENDIX TO LIMEN: Suggestions for Teachers on the Oral Method, and Dialogues for Acting. 9d.

ANTE LIMEN

A new Latin Book for Younger Beginners, based upon *Limen*. Compiled under the guidance of PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY. By R. H. REES, B.A. *Ante Limen* is on similar lines to *Limen*, but is suitable for children under eleven years of age. 2s.; Key, 3s. 3d.

AD LIMEN

Being Reading Lessons and Exercises for a Second and Third Year Course in Latin. By PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY. 3s.; Key, 3s. 3d.

JOHN MURRAY, 50 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

OXFORD BOOKS

CARAVAN CITIES

By

M. ROSTVTZEFF. TRANSLATED FROM THE
RUSSIAN BY D. AND T. TALBOT RICE
ILLUSTRATED. 15s. net

An account of the origin and growth of the caravan routes of the Near East, from the dawn of history, with especial reference to the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

PHASES IN THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ROME

By

CYRIL BAILEY

15s. net

The Sather Lectures, delivered before the University of California

For Christmas

THE OXFORD BOOK OF GREEK VERSE

8s. 6d. net

India paper

10s. net

'... will almost certainly become the accepted *Golden Treasury of Greek*. ... *A delightful book*. ...'—TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

and

THE OXFORD BOOK OF LATIN VERSE

8s. 6d. net

India paper

10s. net

SENECA'S LETTERS TO LUCILIUS

TRANSLATED BY E. PHILLIPS BARKER

12s. 6d. net

'... This excellent translation is prefaced by a Life so profound in its psychological analysis, and so provocative of thought, that we could wish it had been thrice its length. There is no more intriguing figure in the politics and literature of his perplexing period. ...'—*Morning Post*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

